

in the market probably not as great but substantially as great as that of the bonds of the Government itself.

Mr. OWEN. I hope this matter will not take the attitude of being a mere difference of opinion between Senators on the floor, because this is a thing which will affect the Federal Reserve System in a serious way, and it ought not to be dealt with merely as a casual difference of opinion among Senators. It ought to be analyzed, and its consequences ought to be fully weighed before this legislation goes upon the statute books.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not agree with the Senator that it will affect the Federal Reserve System in any harmful way. I think, however, what some Senators have suggested here this evening, to wit, to amend the Federal Reserve System so as to make these long-term notes eligible for discount, would very seriously impair the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. OWEN. That is another question entirely from the one I was raising on this particular bill. These bonds are put upon a parity with Government bonds as a basis of loan by the Federal reserve bank, and when that is done in this bill and then afterwards it proves that the market does not attach to these bonds the same quality it attaches to other bonds, the Federal reserve banks might have their assets impaired.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not wish to prolong this colloquy. I think I understand the Senator's idea. His idea, as I understand him, is to have the Government guarantee these bonds. If the Senator desires to discuss that matter on Monday or when the bill is taken up again I shall be very glad to hear his views upon the subject. Now, merely upon the statement of the Senator, I do not think it would be advisable; but when the Senator elaborates his views about it and analyzes it, as I understand he intends to do, he may change my views about it.

Mr. OWEN. I realize the condition.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate take a recess—

Mr. GALLINGER. Before the Senator makes that motion, may I suggest that he ask that the bill be reprinted with the amendments that have already been agreed to, so that we can see what shape it is in?

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall be very glad to do so. At the suggestion of my colleague on the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be reprinted as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 4, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 2, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John Huddle, D. D., of St. Paul's English Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Out of the wreckage of dismembered nations and blighted civilization, a war-weary world, O God, cries unto Thee. O Lord, hear our cry.

In the midst of smoke and blood make bare Thy mighty arm, and confuse the intelligence and paralyze the force of all antagonism to human rights, and give to men everywhere the prerogative to govern themselves according to their own desires and standards, unhindered by the subtle devices of a designing and selfish ambition.

We praise Thee for the purity of America's purpose, for the unselfishness of her motive. We covet no man's gold, no nation's territory. We are responding to humanity's appeal for government of the people, for the people, and by the people, and we plead, O God, for Thy directing wisdom and almighty power.

Bless the legislators and executives of our land in this gigantic undertaking. Strengthen the bodies and inspire the souls of the men in uniform, in the air, on the sea, and in the trench. Vouchsafe unto them the continuance of the splendid courage they have so far displayed, and hasten the time when they, with their brave allies, shall win for the world a righteous and permanent peace.

Bless the loved ones here who are in sorrow, and others to whom grief will come as the days go. Help their patriotism to rise as far as possible above personal attachment, and comfort them with the thought that "greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend."

Bless all the tender ministries of grace and mercy that bind up the wounded, and fire the hearts of the discouraged with new faith and fortitude. Abide Thou, O God, in all the hospitals, camps, and battle fields of earth, and may men everywhere in this crucial hour find Thee not an empty name, but an all-satisfying reality, giving a peace and a power that pass all understanding.

O Thou Lamb of God that takest away the sins of the world, remove our sins, individual and national, as far as the east is from the west, so that naught may insulate us from the spiritual energies and influences of Him who hath all power in heaven and on earth and is from everlasting to everlasting. In His name we ask it.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the calling into military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following order:

Ordered, That there be appointed by the President pro tempore two additional members of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes, and that in compliance with the above order the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. CUMMINS as such additional conferees on the part of the Senate.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the calling into military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSING FOR WAR NEEDS.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 10265, known as the housing bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 10265, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10265) to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for war needs.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman ask unanimous consent to consider this now?

The SPEAKER. That is what he did.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I shall have to object to that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

VACANCIES IN THE HOUSE.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House resolution 261.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of House resolution 261. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas there are several vacancies in this House, caused by the death and resignation of Members, and it is of vital importance to the country during this war that all districts be represented; and Whereas the governors of the States of New York and Illinois have called special elections to fill the vacancies in those States, but that the governor of Ohio, although requested, has failed to call a special election to fill a vacancy now existing in the fourteenth district of the State of Ohio—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, known as the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, known as the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my resolution be printed in the Record.

Mr. FOSTER. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] use some of his time?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I listened yesterday, along with my colleagues, with a great deal of interest to the able Representative from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. It was in reference to changing the existing law and writing upon the statute book a compulsory eight-hour provision as it affected the clerks in the various Government departments in Washington City.

Of course, we have listened to many speeches on that same subject delivered by our colleague from Missouri. It has been a continuous performance at every session of Congress, almost upon every appropriation bill carrying pay for Government clerks in times of peace as well as during the war. The gentleman has been here actively in season and out of season riding his hobby. He has become such an expert in hobby riding that I think seriously of commending him to the President for appointment to a high commission in the Cavalry service.

Now, what a severe arraignment was it of the present national Democratic administration, an administration elected upon a platform pledged to economy and the abolition of waste and useless and unnecessary offices! The administration not only obtained power and the confidence of the American people upon a pledge of that kind five years ago, but the pledge was repeated in the last campaign; and here is a gentleman who has been in Congress for nine years, elected as a representative of the Missouri Democracy, a champion of the Wilson administration, in the President's confidence, giving to Congress and the American people a certificate to the effect that the national Democratic administration has failed to keep its pledge of economy.

How often did the gentleman tell us yesterday that Congress was throwing away, by not adopting his oft-repeated amendment, \$7,000,000 a year; \$7,000,000 a year, and his administration pledged to economy, having controlled public affairs for seven years in the District of Columbia, is a total waste of \$35,000,000, according to the testimony furnished by the able Representative from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. A little later on.

Mr. BORLAND. Will not the gentleman yield right there?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield now.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Republican Party was arraigned for being wasteful and extravagant with the people's money, and creating,

increasing, and continuing unnecessary and useless offices. After being intrusted with power five years it is not necessary for any Member on the Republican side of the House to point out this glaring failure on the part of a Democratic national administration to redeem its solemn pledge. We have as our leading unimpeachable witness the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. And by and by, when our congressional election is on, it will only be necessary to say "we submit to you, voters of America, the statement of a leading Democratic member of the Committee on Appropriations, who says that for five years, without a protest, without an effort on the part of the President or any of his advisers, no attempt has been made to save this money."

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am dealing with my beloved friend from Missouri now, and I ask my colleague from Florida to excuse me. I entered this body, was elected at the same time with this great critic of the Democratic national administration. We were both first elected to the Sixty-first Congress. Well do I remember that fortunate day which gave me my first introduction to him. It was in the great city of St. Louis nine years ago. We had assembled there on an invitation to join the President of the United States, the members of his Cabinet, United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, governors of the respective States, to go on that great trip on the father of waters—the Mississippi—from St. Louis to New Orleans.

What a magnificent trip it was. The boats were all beautifully decorated representing the various States and cities along the banks of the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers. Everything was free. There was no bone-dry law in existence on the Mississippi River and the café ran night and day. Bands, music, and speeches on board the boats and at the various landings where the multitudes had gathered to meet these distinguished representatives of the American people from President Taft down.

It was on this wonderful excursion I first met the able and genial gentleman from Missouri. He had in his equipment, as I now recall, a large supply of magazines with a splendid article on Kansas City, Mo., pointing out its matchless attractions and great possibilities. And along with it a great and convincing argument in favor of the Government expending from twenty to thirty million dollars on the improvement of the Missouri River from his town, Kansas City, to the Mississippi River.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can the gentleman give me a little more time?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was soon captured by the persuasive arguments and the genial smile of the gentleman from Missouri, and pledged my support early to the \$20,000,000 Missouri River proposition. Along with it was a proposition for a 14-foot channel on the Mississippi River from St. Louis to New Orleans. When the Army engineers got through with that proposition, they said it would cost in the neighborhood of \$200,000,000, and they reported against it. I was told that the Missouri River was so shifting and changeable and so fickle that when a man went to bed at night on the bank of the river the chances were the river would be out of sight the next morning.

Mr. MADDEN. Over in the next State. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. But I committed myself to his project, notwithstanding the enormous cost. The gentleman was so persuasive in his argument about the improvement of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers that I have been voting for every river appropriation for the past nine years. The impression made upon me was lasting, and no sum staggered me at all. During this long period at no time, even when the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Appropriations was sending in bills here that carried countless billions of dollars, without any safeguard as to how it should be expended, whether contracts should be let to the lowest bidder or not, I voted for them until my head swam and I was dizzy. [Laughter.]

A little later on I was honored by a position on the joint commission for the construction of national highways. One night we were charmed and enlightened and made happy by the appearance of my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] at the head of a western delegation in favor of building great national highways.

On January 3, 1918, of this year, when we need money so badly for the war, according to his statement of yesterday, the gentleman from Missouri introduced a bill which provided for constructing a highway over every scout and Indian trail known during the Revolutionary or colonial days. While not fully committing myself to the great, enormous, and far-reaching expenditure of the people's money for that purpose, I fail to

find my own State or district named in it, so I shall offer an amendment at the proper time. Mr. BORLAND, on January 3, 1918, introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Roads and ordered to be printed. It is to be known as the Daughters of the American Revolution old-trails act, to provide a national ocean-to-ocean highway over the pioneer trails of the Nation:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Then it provides for building a highway beginning on the Atlantic Ocean, going through to the Pacific, with side lines, I suppose, to Alaska, Honolulu, and the Philippines. [Laughter.] That is the bill that this great economist introduced in a war period, when he says we ought to economize by increasing the hours of labor in Washington City.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I can not yield.

Mr. LOBECK. I simply wanted to ask if this road came by Omaha.

Mr. AUSTIN. Now, under existing law every member of President Wilson's Cabinet by a stroke of his pen can extend the hours of labor over Government clerks in the city. This proposed law is absolutely unnecessary. It does not require a law. It only requires an order issued by the department to extend the time to eight hours.

Now, I am sure that every member of President Wilson's Cabinet, appreciating and realizing how he obtained office by a platform pledged to economy and the abolition of waste and useless offices, that if he thought it was needed would issue the necessary order and extend the working hour. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed hours of the time of the House of Representatives which might be used to prosecute the war to a speedy termination. We are to delay the signing of the treaty of peace and the closing of this horrible and bloody war, until the gentleman from Missouri can ride his hobby up and down and before the House of Representatives on every appropriation bill from now till the final adjournment of Congress. I appeal to the gentleman in all seriousness, for we are all very fond of him. He is big enough, according to the Missouri standards, to be a Senator from that great State—not according to the Tennessee standards, but according to the Missouri standards. [Laughter.] He has had the training and the experience, he is able, full of energy, trained, tried, and I commend to him to take up a great big proposition which will measure up with his talents, his ability, and his experience.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman mentioned three or four big propositions that I had taken up.

Mr. AUSTIN. But the gentleman has abandoned them, and he is now making war upon some old women and men in various departments of this Government. I saw one of them yesterday on crutches trying to get to his office, and I actually saw one of these old men who had perhaps served in the Army actually pulling himself up the balustrade by all the strength that he had, pulling himself along the stairway leading into the entrance of the department to go to his desk.

Mr. BORLAND. It was on pay day that he was there, was it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, no; and there is not a department of this Government, on account of our failure to pass a wise and just retirement bill, that is not filled with old, faithful, worn-out superannuated Government officials, and they are compelled to go there daily, some of them driven there by their loved relatives in the morning, and helped to their desks, and here is a great Democratic leader from the imperial State of Missouri spending his time asking us to delay legislation until he can crowd upon these old, withered, and palsied people an extra hour of labor. What has the war done for Washington? It has made this one of the greatest congested centers in the country.

Everything has advanced in price, all the necessities of life, everything that a Government clerk has to purchase has advanced in price. Everything has advanced except the salary of the Government clerk, fixed a half century ago, and there has been no general rearrangement or readjustment or equalization or advancement in Government salaries for a half century, but all during these 50 years every article which he must have for the home, every luxury, every necessity, every want for his loved wife and children has advanced, and he has become the victim of unfortunate circumstances here in the Capital City of his country incident to this great war. The gentleman from Missouri, not thinking of this, not appreciating this, not considering it at all, is here attempting to have his colleagues place upon these people greater and harder burdens and responsibilities. I object to it. He says that we are fighting a world war for democracy, but here is a great Capital City

with three or four hundred thousand people, without a voice in Congress, actually being taxed without representation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to give me five minutes more, in which time I think I can finish.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think we are all touched by the graphic narration of conditions in respect to the old, decrepid, and, in the language of the gentleman from Tennessee, withered employees of the Government in the District, and I feel compelled, even though my time is limited, to yield to the gentleman's entreaty and give him five minutes more.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, here is this great Capital City without representation in Congress, and we are taxing its inhabitants. They have no voice in the selection of their local, municipal, or District officials, and yet we are sending our boys abroad for world-wide democracy, to establish and enforce the rule of the people everywhere in the world, except in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I yield to my handsome friend from Chicago.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee think that he ought to withdraw a part of the promise he made to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] in respect to the expenditure of these vast sums of money in this shifting stream that moves from one State to another overnight and ask the aid of the gentleman from Missouri for an increase in compensation of these very worthy employees of the Government in the District of Columbia?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, that is a very good suggestion, and now, while the gentleman yesterday devoted some of his remarks to profiteering and attempting to get something from the Government by these humble clerks who are without a defender on the floor of the House of Representatives in the shape of their own chosen Representative, I commend to him the hearings of the various committees on Hog Island, on contracts for military camps, for war supplies, where his own committee has voted without a string to it millions of dollars without restrictions as to how they should be expended, without safeguarding the appropriations in reference to the letting of contracts, and I commend to him that he devote some of his talents to that important and far-reaching work if he seriously wishes to champion the interests of the taxpayer and save him money and for the time being give a rest to the Government clerks, to the watchmen, to the messengers, to the scrub women in the various departments of the Government, leaving to the Democratic members of the Cabinet to determine when public business requires an order to extend the hours of labor in the various departments of the Government. Although not a member of his party, but a partisan Republican, I shall not use my time and voice for a condemnation and indictment of the Democratic President and Democratic members of the Cabinet. I yield that honor to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. [Applause.] I yield back the remainder of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. OLDFIELD having taken the chair as speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6361) to extend protection to the civil rights of members of the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States engaged in the present war.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask the attention of the Members to a War Department regulation, which I hope will soon be changed as a matter of justice to soldiers who are properly enlisted, and who are discharged in less than 90 days for disability. I desire also to call attention to some war-risk insurance problems. The people demand that this Nation be fair and just in its treatment of its soldiers and sailors. As a rule, the United States has been fair and just, and I am pleased to report that one unfair regulation is now being adjusted. Recently I received some complaints that soldiers taken into the new Army, who had developed tuberculosis or other disease within three months after enlistment, were being discharged because of disability not incurred in line of

duty. I reported one of these cases to The Adjutant General and received the following statement:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 20, 1918.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON.

DEAR SIR: In response to your letter of the 12th instant relative to Pvt. Gavin H. Bayne, Company M, One hundred and sixty-second Infantry, I have the honor to advise you that the tuberculosis in the case of this soldier was shown to exist within less than three months after his entry into service, and that under the rules of the Medical Department his disability must therefore be considered to have not been contracted in line of duty.

As this case is like many others, the same action must be accorded all, and no exceptions can be made to rules adopted.

Regretting that I am unable to advise you favorably in this matter, I remain,

Very respectfully,

H. P. MCCAIN,
The Adjutant General.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Did this man pass the physical examination before he entered the Army?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes. If the gentleman will permit me, I am coming to that. There is a desire on the part of the Medical Department to remedy this situation.

This man, after having been properly examined and enlisted, was found to have developed tuberculosis, and was promptly set out of the Army, the United States refusing to accept the liability it had incurred.

Manifestly, I could not stop with this statement from The Adjutant General, which is based on a regulation made at a time when men were being taken into the Army with great care, and after severe medical examination. I took the matter up with the Surgeon General, and have received the following letter, which will be of interest to the Members of the House and to the public generally:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, February 27, 1918.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of February 23, addressed to Gen. Gorgas, the Surgeon General directs me to say that the ruling quoted by The Adjutant General is the ruling which has heretofore obtained, the principle being that men who manifest a chronic condition in less than three months after entering the service must obviously have had the disability before entering the service. It is not believed, therefore, that this ruling is an unfair one.

However, steps have been taken to change the ruling, and the Surgeon General has recently recommended that in all cases a man who has once passed the examination for entering the Army shall be considered to have contracted any subsequent disability in the line of duty.

Yours, very truly,

(Signed) G. E. BUSHNELL,
Colonel, United States Army, Retired.

It will be noted that the Surgeon General has recommended that—

In all cases a man who has once passed the examination for entering the Army shall be considered to have contracted any subsequent disability in line of duty.

Clearly such a recommendation must be approved by the War Department.

I sincerely hope that the recommendation will be considered and accepted. I presume that every Member has had cases of this kind.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's statement. Do I understand this is the case of a young man drafted who developed tuberculosis?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Who is held not to be entitled now, under the ruling made, to the provisions of the benefits that we have provided?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes. He was drafted into the Army and passed the medical examination, but within three months this disability was discovered, and it is held that it was not incurred in the line of duty, so he receives his discharge for disability received outside the line of duty.

Mr. WALSH. But there is nothing in the law requiring that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This is a regulation, nevertheless. These official letters are dated within the last two or three days.

Mr. ROBBINS. How does that affect the war-risk insurance that the man took out when he entered the service?

Mr. WALSH. He gets his benefits.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am coming to war-risk insurance matters.

Mr. ROBBINS. There are a number of similar cases all over the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No doubt of it. I suppose every Member has had numerous cases. I might add that as

war-risk insurance problems develop every Congressman will find his office work increased greatly beyond its present heavy run.

Mr. Chairman, the case of discharge I have mentioned refers to the Army, and is based on a regulation. Now, let me tell of a discharge case which I have which has been running in the Navy since last summer. It is this:

From southwestern Washington a boy 18 years old, after seeing and reading the alluring posters inviting enlistment in the Navy, enlisted regularly in the Navy out there, went to Puget Sound, and was put on a warship. He was taken down the far side of the Pacific coast through the Panama Canal into the Atlantic Ocean, and the vessel brought up at Pensacola, Fla., where that boy was discharged for undesirability and set ashore without even a street car ticket in his pocket; 18 years old and 4,000 miles from home, without bed or bread—the position of a tramp. That boy wrote a letter from Pensacola to his mother out in the State of Washington saying that he would try to work his way home and that he would go through New Orleans. His mother's friends telegraphed me to see why he had been discharged. I wrote to the Navy Department asking for the reason, and received a short, sharp letter saying that he was discharged "because he was undesirable and dirty." I could not send any such letter to that mother, who has another son in the service of the United States in the Army. I went down personally to investigate. I found that this boy, in the course of that trip in the service, about four months in the Navy, in coming through the Panama Canal had developed an extreme case of dysentery, had run way down in weight, had been unable to keep himself clean, had become sick and helpless, and was set ashore at Pensacola, discharged as undesirable, left there without a 5-cent piece in money, and was informed that he owed the Government \$20 for his naval uniform. The boy reached New Orleans by dead-beating his way. With the aid of the Bankers' Association of the United States detectives were employed and that boy discovered and money was handed him to make his way home, where he arrived sick and helpless. The Navy Department afterwards admitted that a mistake had been made and that the boy should have been transferred back to the Puget Sound naval district before they discharged him. My contention is that once the Navy enlisted that boy and took charge of him this Government was in fact his guardian and he was its ward, and it was its duty to feed and clothe him and care for him in sickness and that instead of discharging him he should have been sent to a United States marine hospital. That boy, in my opinion, has a claim against this Government for money expended by kind-hearted friends in locating him and in sending him home and a further claim for the damage to his health.

Now, that is only one case. I have waited months to hear something further from the Navy Department, which has shown some interest in the matter, and I sincerely believe that the commander of that vessel who set that boy ashore deserves to be punished and reduced in numbers.

Mr. MADDEN. He ought to be dishonorably discharged from the service for doing such a thing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have withheld a statement of this kind because we are at war, and I do not want to do one thing to embarrass the Government, but we can not have our parents believe that their boys are not receiving the best possible attention from those we have placed in charge of them, and officers who do not properly care for soldiers and sailors need to be punished.

Now, to get back to this war-risk insurance discussion. The wife of this soldier, sick with tuberculosis, whose case I just described, has been unable up to date to secure the allotment that this soldier undertook to make to her. Neither has she secured the Government allowance for dependence to which she is entitled, and her case is no different from that of many others in the far West, due, no doubt, to the great distance and the general confusion in connection with the organization of a great bureau. I want to say that before long the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance will be as large as the Treasury Department was before the war began. It is a bureau which was confronted on its very first day with a tremendous amount of work. These facts are responsible for a lot of this confusion. I make no criticism of the bureau, but it needs and will need much more help.

I have another case where a wife was receiving her allotment from the War Department up to the time that the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance was established. Her soldier husband is now in France.

When the War-Risk Insurance Bureau was established the allotment which she got under the law was dropped until trans-

fer could be made, after a new application by her husband. That soldier is far away in France, her allowance is cut off, and a long space of time has occurred in an effort to find that boy in France so as to get a new statement formally made. It has not come yet. That woman is without money.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not differing with the gentleman, but let me give the reason for this. I have had considerable experience in the same line. The War-Risk Insurance Bureau has no authority under the law to pay to a widow any portion of the soldier's salary until they have received an order from that soldier.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I agree to that, of course. I contend that the transfer should have been automatic. This man dealt with the War Department before the war-risk law was enacted.

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a minute, please; on the other hand, suppose the soldier withdraws that allotment to the family. Suppose he is in France and draws the money over there—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is true.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the law compels him to pay to his wife any portion of his money, that is one thing—

Mr. MADDEN. It does compel every soldier to allot to his wife.

Mr. FORDNEY. They have no authority to pay the money until they receive an order from him, law or no law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This man in good faith made an allotment as far as he knew under the law and then went to France. Now, let us see what really happened.

Mr. MADDEN. The law compels the allotment, it is compulsory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let us see what really happened in this particular case. Here is a letter from Director Delaney, of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau, and he advises as follows:

Under the act of October 6, 1917, every enlisted man is required to fill out and file an allotment statement, and unless he does, the bureau is powerless to make an allotment and allowance of his pay to his dependents. A careful search of the records in this bureau has failed to show that said Frank D. Wickersham has filed such an application. The \$15 already received by Mrs. Wickersham, as referred to in her letter, evidently came from the War Department before this bureau went into operation under the act of October 6, 1917, and payments from November on are made through this bureau, provided the enlisted man files an allotment statement.

Mr. FORDNEY. Here is where the War-Risk Insurance Bureau's hands are tied. Suppose a man is in France and has a wife who left him and he does not want to allot any more and she has got some right to a portion of his income.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If a man makes an allotment month by month she should receive it until he serves notice that she should be cut off.

Mr. FORDNEY. The gentleman will find that the order of every soldier in every instance is for a specific time.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not true that the law provides that the soldier is compelled to allot that to his wife, and also there is a provision in the law where he is living apart from his wife, she is also entitled to an allotment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think so.

Mr. HAMLIN. If the gentleman will permit, in case this soldier refuses to permit the making of an allotment the wife may apply herself and get it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It runs arbitrarily. Now, a word as to delay in payments. In the far West the delay in making allotments under the system of the organization has been fearful. The delay has caused me to receive a very heavy mail. Almost every day lately I receive a telegram from some commercial organization or municipal organization in my district reading like this one:

VANCOUVER, WASH., March 1.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.:

We have men here who were drafted and have now been in the service almost five months who have families and children, and whose pay has been held back because of the allotment to the wife, whose families are now destitute because the allotment due the family held out of the soldier's pay has not been paid. Their families are virtually dependent on charity for houses in which to live and are without credit at the stores, and some of them are in actual want. Something must be done. Why can not the allotment due the families be paid? Applications have been coming to us daily in cases of this kind, and we can not provide for all of them.

W. G. DROWLEY,
President Commercial Club.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In a moment. I wish to call attention to still one more case out in my district. In this case

a soldier boy was killed. He was the sole support of a mother who was divorced. That mother was not a widow within the meaning of our generous congressional act of October 6, 1917, as interpreted by the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance. She is not entitled to her dead boy's insurance, which was meant for her and for no one else.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will; yes.

Mr. ROGERS. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his formal communication, which he sent to the Senate some days ago, said that he expected the work of the war-risk insurance would be right up to the minute by the last week in February. Does the gentleman know whether that statement was correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I hope it is correct. If it was up by the last week of February that would mean one week later on the Pacific coast.

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly, but is not the great delay, when we reduce it to the lowest terms, owing to the miles intervening between us and the American Expeditionary Forces?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I realize that and I am not making a criticism of the bureau. I am suggesting an amendment of the law. Of course, the War-Risk Insurance Bureau is working hard, night and day, trying to catch up.

Why they have 2,400 employees down there, and they need a whole lot more, and yet we read in the papers right now that another great bureau, the Shipbuilding Corporation, is just about to establish a weekly newspaper, another governmental newspaper. If I had my way I would order all these embryonic editors over into the War-Risk Bureau to help it catch up, and do it right quick, too. [Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman know that the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance has recently perfected a plan by which a wife can receive the allotment to which she is entitled from the Government, even though the soldier's allotment for her had not been received?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have no doubt they are perfecting a plan to do it, but I am afraid there will be a lot of red tape about it, and in the meantime I dislike to read telegrams from chambers of commerce and others saying that they can not take care of the dependents.

Mr. ROGERS. I am not trying to defend the bureau, but I think the difficulties are enormous.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I admit that. The bureau needs no defense, but I think we should make some changes in the law.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Of course the gentleman appreciates the fact that this is an entirely new venture on the part of the Government, and that they have to take care of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of cases, and they have to start in anew and get them perfected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course. I say that they started on their first day with a tremendous business in front of them, and I say they need thousands of more clerks, and I contend that we should cut down during the war any and every inactive or dispensable bureau of the Government. For instance, the Geological Survey, suspend it and transfer the clerks over there where they are needed. And I am also inclined to think that before we perfect the War-Risk Insurance System we will be forced to set up a branch in every one of the States.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAMLIN. You spoke a while ago about this divorced mother not being able to draw the insurance of this son. Does the gentleman understand that the soldiers name the beneficiaries?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In this case it was automatic insurance. A letter which I started to read shows that.

Mr. HAMLIN. I will be glad to hear it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This is from the War-Risk Insurance Bureau of the Treasury Department, and is as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1918.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 12th instant in the matter of the claim for automatic insurance filed by Mrs. _____, of Tacoma, Wash., inclosing certified copy of the claimant's decree of divorce from her husband, _____, and in reply would advise that inasmuch as Mrs. _____ had been granted an absolute decree of divorce from her husband prior to the death of her son, she was not a widowed mother within the meaning of the term as used in the act of Congress of October 6, 1917, and as interpreted by this bureau.

If she should be able to prove the decree of divorce granted her was merely an interlocutory decree, which had never been made final, and if she could also prove that the deceased's father, _____, is actually

dead as a matter of fact, we would be glad to reopen the matter and give consideration to such proof, but as the case now stands Mrs. _____ is not entitled to automatic insurance on account of the death of her son.

It does not seem probable that the Kreider bill, H. R. 8644, if enacted by Congress, would have any effect upon this claim.

Sincerely, yours,

WILLIAM C. DE LANOT, *Director*.

Mr. HAMLIN. Now I think I understand that. I think the gentleman will remember that they made an order that all soldiers or drafted men or enlisted men who happened to die before the 1st of November, as I remember it now, would automatically come in under the law as we passed it.

Mr. KEARNS. The law provides that it shall be payable to his estate if he has named no one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is correct; but here is a case of a soldier boy whose mother deserves her insurance and does not get it. Why, I understand that the mother of the first American boy killed in France is unable to get that boy's insurance because she was a widow who had remarried. That is the J. B. Gresham case—one of the three boys killed in the first German raid on our trenches. His was automatic insurance. My colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], has the matter in hand.

In this bill there are some clauses pertaining to the method of payment of clerks to Congressmen. So far as I have been able to observe, most Members of Congress use more clerk hire than allowed to them by the Government; and I will venture the assertion that as this war-risk business goes on every Member will need an additional clerk. This matter has hardly started. From my State a large number of soldiers were sent very early to France on account of their knowledge of forestry, and my mail is loaded with problems and questions arising out of the insurance bill, the automatic insurance, and the allotments and allowances.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Has the gentleman any experience in the delay in the transmission of things sent to the boys in France?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is mostly accidental, with some cumbersome regulations in the way.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Not accidental.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A registered letter can not get beyond New York to a boy in France, and neither can an insured parcel-post package.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Every once in a while a condition arises which is an absolute outrage. I am weary of that condition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Some of the little things are going wrong, but the big things are going right.

Mr. SNOOK. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington what officer it is that has the right to say the final word on this regulation with regard to discharge of sick men?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The Adjutant General, first, I presume.

Mr. MADDEN. The Adjutant General has no power over it. It is the President of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, I think the Secretary of War. Finally perhaps it would run to the President.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FESS. In reference to that feature of the compulsory allotment, may I not read the law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will be very glad to hear it.

Mr. FESS. It says:

SEC. 201. That allotment of pay shall, subject to the conditions, limitations, and exceptions hereinafter specified, be compulsory as to wife, a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed, and a child, and voluntary as to any other person; but on the written consent of the wife or former wife divorced, supported by evidence satisfactory to the bureau of her ability to support herself and the children in her custody, the allotment for her and for such children may be waived, and on the enlisted man's application or otherwise for good cause shown, exemption from the allotment may be granted upon such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is the law, of course, but the questions I have presented deal with the transfer of automatic insurance, the position of widows in connection therewith; and principally the discharge of soldiers who become sick during their first 90 days of service, which is not a war-risk insurance matter at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the resolution which I sought to have adopted here by unanimous-consent request reads as follows:

House resolution 261.

Whereas there are several vacancies in this House, caused by the death and resignation of Members, and it is of vital importance to the country during this war that all districts be represented; and

Whereas the governors of the States of New York and Illinois have called special elections to fill the vacancies in those States, but that the governor of Ohio, although requested, has failed to call a special election to fill a vacancy now existing in the fourteenth district of the State of Ohio: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of this House write the governor of Ohio, requesting him to call a special election to fill such vacancy.

That was all my resolution called for—that the Speaker of this House should write to the governor of Ohio requesting him to call a special election in the fourteenth district of Ohio, which was represented by Congressman Bathrick, now deceased. Unless there is a special election called, the fourteenth district of Ohio will be without a Congressman for over a year, because the Congressman that is to be selected this year will not take his seat until the 4th day of March 4, 1919.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. EMERSON. No; I can not yield now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. EMERSON. To this, my application for unanimous consent for the consideration of this resolution, some Democrat objected. I do not know what was in the colossal mind of a Democrat to object to the passing of a simple resolution of this kind. The Speaker of this House wrote the Republican governor of New York asking him to call a special election in the districts of that State that were without representation, and that Republican governor did it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The districts in New York are Democratic districts. Has that escaped the gentleman's notice? The district in Ohio is a Republican district.

Mr. EMERSON. It does not make any difference whether the district is Republican or Democratic. That district ought to be represented, and a resolution calling upon the governor to call a special election ought to be adopted by this House.

Mr. FESS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Has my colleague any information as to why the governor refused to call a special election?

Mr. EMERSON. I wrote to the governor two weeks ago requesting him to call a special election in the fourteenth district. I did that upon the request of some residents of that district. He never gave me the courtesy of a reply. Four days ago I telegraphed the governor of Ohio, asking him why he did not answer my letter. I have never received even the courtesy of a reply to that message.

Now, here is what the Speaker of this House said in his letter to the governor of New York:

In these troublous times we need a full membership. Can't you help us out by calling special elections in the New York districts?

Now, if that is true in New York, why should it not be true in Ohio? Why should not the fourteenth district of Ohio be represented on the floor of this House? Whether by a Republican or a Democrat, it makes no difference. And why should a Democratic Congressman object to a unanimous-consent request for the immediate consideration of that simple resolution?

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. DILL. Does a special election in New York State apply to all the districts, including the one of the Congressman now in the Army?

Mr. EMERSON. I do not know how many districts there are. It does not make any difference. Every district should be filled on the floor of this House during this war.

Mr. DILL. I simply asked that for information.

Mr. EMERSON. Every Congressman from the State of Ohio has been called upon to perform the duties that the Congressman from this district should perform and would perform if he were here.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not know who it was who objected to the consideration of the gentleman's resolution. May it not have been prompted by the idea that if you would go to the Speaker and make a request that he write to Gov. Cox you would accomplish the same thing?

Mr. EMERSON. I will say to my friend that no one has more respect for the Speaker of this House than I. Possibly the Speaker would have written the letter if I had asked him; but after I had written the governor himself two weeks ago and he did not give me the courtesy of a reply, I felt that a letter from the Speaker of this House, backed up by a reso-

lution of this House, might penetrate his stubborn brain. That is the way I thought about it. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMLEN. I think the gentleman could accomplish the same thing by speaking to the Speaker privately about it.

Mr. EMERSON. That may be true.

Section 4829 of the statutes of the State of Ohio provides: "When a vacancy to the office of Representative to Congress or senator or representative to the general assembly occurs the governor, upon satisfactory information thereof, shall issue a writ of election directing that a special election be held to fill such vacancy in the territory entitled to fill it on the day specified in the writ."

There is nothing but politics in the refusal of the governor to call a special election. The fourteenth district, although it was represented by a Democrat, is normally Republican. The governor is undoubtedly afraid of the political effect of the election of a Republican Congressman from this district. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago the House passed a resolution calling upon the Postmaster General for information concerning the Postal Service between the United States and the members of the American Expeditionary Force in France. The Postmaster General replied in due course, stating, in substance, that the usual time for the transmission of mails from the United States to the soldiers in France was from 15 to 30 days. Subsequently to that time I made some remarks in the House in which, I think, I proved from my personal knowledge and experience that the Postmaster General had been misinformed when he made that statement, and that the average time was far in excess of 15 days; indeed, far in excess of 30 days, which the Postmaster General had cited as the maximum of the usual time in transit.

As a result of that speech in the House I have been flooded with letters from all parts of the country, some from as far as San Francisco, and from practically every State of the Union, giving me specific instances of the accuracy of my statements and of the misinformation contained in the report of the Postmaster General. I have time to read but one of those letters. I read it because I think it is typical of conditions which prevail throughout the United States:

I have recently read with interest of your remarks in relation to lost and delayed mail to our forces overseas. In substantiation of your claim I would like to state my own case, which I have every reason to believe is not unusual among those whose relatives are abroad with the American armies.

Since the middle of September, when my husband, who is a major of the Regular Infantry, went to France, I have sent not less than three letters to him each week, one package of magazines each week, and during the past months have sent innumerable packages containing toilet articles, tobacco, cigarettes, and such eatables as are not barred by regulations—shelled nuts, prepared coffee, chocolate, etc. I have adhered strictly to postal regulations in every particular and have put my return address on every package. In a recent letter from my husband, written January 19—

And at that time, it will be noticed, he had been in France something over four months—

he tells me but two letters reached him which were written by me during the month of November (which means about 15 were lost, written that month alone), and he had received but two packages of magazines—absolutely no tobacco, though I have sent pounds and pounds; not one package of toilet articles, though dozens have been dispatched. On November 15 I sent by American Express to New York a Christmas box, value upward of \$30. This was taken by transport to France with promise of delivery by Christmas. January 19 it had not reached France, or rather had not been delivered, at least.

My husband writes he worries much about us at home, lest I am ill or the children are not well. Why do I not write? Why do I not answer his questions?

Our officers in France have too much responsibility and too much else to concern them to be annoyed in this way.

And I may say that every man in France, whether he be an officer or an enlisted man, has too much on his mind to be bothered about things of this kind—

I am now sending as many as five or six letters each week, hoping he will get part at least, and am registering some of them.

This letter incloses a copy of an article which appeared in the Paris edition of the Chicago Tribune in January, and which I think is of interest because it presents from the point of view of the soldiers who are in France the conditions as they are prevailing across the ocean at this moment:

Although more than six months have elapsed since the first units of the American Expeditionary Force arrived in France there seems to be very little improvement in the mail service between the various units of the forces now in this country, while the mail service between soldiers and their relatives in the United States surpasses anything America ever has seen before in red-tape inefficiency and callousness to improvement.

Mail between units of the forces in France now requires from three days to three weeks for transmission. The French Government transmits mail over the same respective areas in from one to three days, and in rare cases four.

The Army Edition—

Which is the name by which the Paris edition of the Chicago Tribune is known—

has been keeping a careful check on the mail it receives in its shopping department, where from 50 to 300 letters are received each day from soldiers in Europe. Most of these letters come through the Army post office, but a few from isolated units come by way of the French Government post. Almost invariably from three to four times the amount of time is consumed through the American Army post office.

The Army Edition made it the practice to send purchased goods to the soldiers through the American Army post, but several packages have not yet been delivered after one and two months, if they have not been lost altogether. Now an effort is made to send the goods by French express to some town where the buying soldier can call for the goods. In this case the goods are delivered in from one to four or five days.

The reason for the almost insufferable mail conditions in the American Expeditionary Force lies at the door of the Post Office Department in Washington; indeed, of Postmaster General Burleson himself. The Expeditionary post office in Paris does the best it can to handle the mail placed before it, but the force employed is hardly half the number which the volume of business requires.

The officials whom Washington still permits to direct the home postal affairs, seem unable to realize the unusual conditions with which the Expeditionary post office must cope in France. The Paris post-office headquarters never sees a day or a night with the work before it half done. Not only must it handle the mail with an inadequate force but it must turn the mail over to French conveyances. The two systems naturally do not coordinate.

The Army Edition has received several letters from residents of the United States asking us to trace certain soldiers from whom no word had been received for from four to five months. On investigation it was found that some of these soldiers had been writing home regularly, and in two cases had been sending money ever since their arrival in France. There is no way to discover whether or not these letters have been lost or are lying "somewhere in the mails."

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute.

Mr. STAFFORD. At this juncture I will yield to the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I made something of an investigation of this mail situation as a member of the Post Office Committee, and I think it might be illuminating to tell the story, if I may be permitted.

Mr. ROGERS. I should think it would be of extreme value if the gentleman would tell the story, but will he not do so in his own time? I have only six minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought it would be just exactly where the gentleman would like to have it.

Mr. ROGERS. I have only six minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not want information, then?

Mr. ROGERS. I certainly do, but I have only six minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought perhaps if the gentleman wanted information I could give it to him, and explain the case he describes.

Mr. ROGERS. How long will it take?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to do it now.

Mr. ROGERS. If I can get more time, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be very glad to yield time to the gentleman from Illinois, so that he may give this information, which is of value to all Members of the House.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am not able to vouch for the accuracy of the article which I read from the Paris edition of the Chicago Tribune. I have quoted it here to-day largely because I assume it is believed to be accurate by the people across the sea, and because it is probably accepted as gospel by our soldiers who very generally read this particular paper to the exclusion of other papers, as it is the only one that contains the sort of news in which they are interested, and which they get fresh from the press. I recognize that the Post Office Department is fully conversant with the deficiencies of the mail service, and is seeking to improve them. I think it is working hard in order to bring about an improvement. I am inclined to think that on the whole the responsibility is not primarily with the Post Office Department, but is at least coordinately shared by some other department of the Government. Of course, the Post Office Department does not deliver the mails actually into the hands of the soldiers.

But we are not told what the Post Office Department is doing. We are not informed what plans it is maturing in order to bring about an improvement. I wish that the Postmaster General felt at liberty to take the House of Representatives and the country into his complete confidence as to where the difficulty lies and as to what steps are being taken in order to improve the service. The service really is execrable, and it is an important matter to the waging of this war. There is no question that the morale of the soldiers rises or falls in

accordance with the excellence or the deficiencies of the Postal Service to France.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department has begun an investigation of this question. I do not know how much progress it has made or is planning to make. There are two requests for rules pending before the Committee on Rules which, if reported out, would mean an investigation of this subject. To me it is a question upon which the best minds of the country should be at work in order to bring about a better condition of affairs. I hope that the House of Representatives may take up the matter and may seek to assist the Post Office Department in making conditions very much better than they are to-day. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. EVANS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I was unfortunately detained out of the Chamber for a few moments and did not hear all of the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] just preceding the last speaker. I came in near the conclusion, however, and caught enough to understand that the gentleman was indulging in some criticism of me because I had objected earlier in the day's proceedings to the consideration of a resolution that he presented and asked unanimous consent to consider, calling upon the governor of Ohio to call an election to fill a vacancy which exists in one of the congressional districts in that State. I have simply asked for this time, therefore, Mr. Chairman, to state the reasons why I made that objection.

The Constitution of the United States provides that where a vacancy in representation occurs the executive authority of a State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancy. I do not know that I quote the exact language, but that is the substance of it. That is a matter which addresses itself to the discretion of the executive authority of the State in which the vacancy occurs, and it seemed to me, and seems to me now, that it would be an unwarranted interference, or attempt at interference, with the discretion of the executive of a sovereign State for this body officially to pass a resolution calling upon that executive to perform that function. It occurs to me that it would be an improper encroachment, or attempt to encroach, upon that discretion for this body to take any such action. I think it would be in extremely bad taste. It was for that reason and that reason alone that I made objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would it not be deemed by the governor of Ohio as simply advisory?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, of course it could not be any more than that. There would be no way by which to compel the governor to do it. But the point I make is that it is in extremely bad taste to essay that advice to the executive authority of a sovereign State.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The honorable Speaker of the House addressed a letter to the governor of New York requesting him to call a special election to fill vacancies, when, according to newspaper report, the governor was not going to call a special election to fill four vacancies.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. My recollection is that that letter was addressed to the governor of New Hampshire, but possibly he addressed both the New Hampshire and New York governors. Let me say that I do not think there was any bad taste in that. That was the action of Mr. CLARK of Missouri as an individual making a suggestion to the governor.

Mr. STAFFORD. As the titular head of this body.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not so understand it. He was not then Speaker of the House except as he held over from a prior term. His action was that of an individual Member and in an advisory capacity, expressing his views in an effort to have some action.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the letter addressed to the governor of New York he was at that time Speaker of the House of Representatives and acting in the particular capacity of Speaker, and his individual views reflected the judgment of the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not remember when the letter was written, whether during the session of Congress or whether it was after the Sixty-fourth Congress had adjourned sine die; but it does not matter either way, because the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] signed the letter, and not the Speaker of the House. It was, I understand, signed simply "CHAMP CLARK." But I see a very great distinction between one writing as an individual making a suggestion to the executive authority and this body itself passing a resolution and

thus attempting official action. That is all I care to say upon that point. Now, if the gentleman from Tennessee will yield me three minutes more, I want to say something about the matter referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I simply wanted to make this statement. I presume I violate no confidence in making the statement. I had occasion upon yesterday to have an interview with The Adjutant General of the Army, Gen. Henry P. McCain, in behalf of a mother who had written me asking me to aid her, if I could, in looking up her son, a second lieutenant in the Reserve Artillery Corps in France.

I presented the situation to The Adjutant General, and he said, in substance, "I am in a position to sympathize deeply with this lady. I have myself a son, a captain in the Artillery in France, from whom I have not heard since December last, and an effort to locate him by cable has failed."

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to state something in reference to the situation which the gentleman from Massachusetts declined?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes; at the end of this sentence. The fact is, in my opinion, the delay in hearing from these young men is not due to faults of the Mail Service. Of course, I have no doubt that there are some inevitable conditions, but that there is wanton and willful neglect no one could convince me, and the very fact that The Adjutant General of the Army himself could not even by cable ascertain the whereabouts or hear from his own son would seem to me to be sufficient evidence that the fault is not in the Mail Service. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, my investigation discloses this situation. Until recently all of the mail sent to the soldiers in France was handled by the French Government, and no attempt was made to distribute or deliver the mail to the soldiers. Buildings under the jurisdiction of the French Government were literally filled with mail, piled up without even being unpacked.

But no such condition has arisen, I think, since the American Government organized and installed the Postal Service for the Expeditionary Force. That activity has been placed under the Second Assistant Postmaster General, who has jurisdiction over the transportation of the mail, and also over the handling of the mail after it reaches France. To-day the mail is sent to the soldier whose name must be written on the envelope, with his unit, care of the Expeditionary Forces in France, and handled by the postal employees of the United States Government, who are delivering the mail to the regimental headquarters for each regiment. The mail is distributed to the soldiers of the regiment by the organization of the regiment.

There ought not to be any difficulty about delivering the mail now, and I do not think there is any serious difficulty. All the complaints that have heretofore been made or the dissatisfaction which existed was due entirely to the fact that the delivery of the mail was supposed to be attempted by the French Government, but no attempt was made by the Government to deliver that mail. Thousands of men have been permitted, as my investigation shows, to go into buildings where the mail is piled up mountain high, and try to pick out their own mail, and you might as well look for a needle in a haystack. Since we have taken jurisdiction I do not believe there is any just cause for complaint, but, of course, the mail is not delivered as quickly as it could be across the street.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. When did this improvement begin?

Mr. MADDEN. We have only had the organization a little more than a month, and it could not have begun until recently.

Mr. ROGERS. I had two letters this week postmarked in France December 18.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no trouble about getting the mail here.

Mr. ROGERS. There was in that case.

Mr. MADDEN. From all I can learn, they get the mail here as promptly as they could expect to receive it, considering the irregular movement of the ships.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I have had a great many letters complaining, as other Members doubtless have, of the inexcusable delay in the mail of our soldiers in France. I had one this morning from a constituent stating:

I have just received a letter from my brother, dated February 7, advising me that he has not received any mail from his people here at home. We have been sending him letters, papers, and packages regularly since December 1, and it seems as if most of it should be delivered by this time.

That is just a specimen letter. I have received many similar letters and have referred to some of them before in the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to my friend that a great many letters came back from soldiers whose parents had sent them letters, and they were handed to me, and that caused me to investigate this situation, and I am just as well satisfied as one can be from investigation that every effort possible is being made to make deliveries of mail now.

Mr. GILLETTE. I hope so.

Mr. MADDEN. And that all of the delay up to within the last month was caused by the failure of the French Government to handle the mail.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the bill under consideration with the exception of possibly two or three items in it. Recently there has been considerable criticism in the press of the country and by men in high political positions here in Washington of the War Department for its failure to come up to the ideal standard of certain people in the country. It is not my purpose in these few minutes to open that controversy or to enter into it now, but I believe the time has come when all criticism should cease, and we should all join harmoniously in trying to bring this war to as speedy a conclusion as possible by one and all, young and old, joining in the war against the Kaiser and not warring among ourselves.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does not refer to criticism of the kind that I made a few moments ago, which was directed at legislation in accordance with war measures?

Mr. COX. Oh, no; I do not refer to that at all. What the gentleman said was not criticism but constructive pure and simple. I refer to recent criticisms made by a Senator at the other end of the Capitol. Criticism is one thing and constructive legislation is quite another. I never in my life have had much use for an out-and-out critic. I never had much use for a theorist. I have always all my life endeavored to deal with facts. It may be that has come to me as a result of my profession, dealing in cold-steel facts that surround a given proposition. I have never in my life taken very kindly to simply criticism unless the critic at the time of making it was able to substitute a constructive program that would supersede the other that was being criticized.

My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] a moment ago said that he wished the Post Office Department would take the Members of the House into its confidence. I had an occasion the other day to say that the Post Office was not only ready but willing and anxious to take every Member of this House into its confidence, and if the Members of the House will only go down and consult the Postmaster General about the delay in the mail between here and the fighting line in France I am sure they will get the information they desire.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes; for a short question.

Mr. ROGERS. Did not the Postmaster General in his report say there were no delays?

Mr. COX. I do not remember just what his report did say.

Mr. ROGERS. May I read just one short sentence—"The time required"—

Mr. COX. Oh, no; I object to that. The gentleman can put that into his own speech. As a matter of fact, there are some delays in the delivery of mail to the soldiers in France. There is no question about that. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] hit the keynote. I think the mail is going to the soldiers in France and is being distributed as rapidly as possible. This follows, and will rapidly improve—as fast as the soldiers are definitely settled in their commands. Every foreign government fighting on French soil to-day had for months and months the same trouble that we are having. I had occasion to talk to a man from England the other day who had to do with the delivery of the mails to English soldiers in France for two years, and he told me that they had the same trouble in England getting the mail to and from the soldiers that we are having, and that their trouble lasted six months before they were able to overcome it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And Canada had the same trouble.

Mr. COX. I think that is true. We must remember that down to this time the soldiers are not permanently stationed

over there unless it has been within the last 30 days. They are being moved from place to place and shifted around from point to point. Mail is constantly following the soldier on his rounds from the place where he was shifted to the place where he is going finally to land. I know how trying it must be to fathers, mothers, or wives who are trying to get letters delivered to their boys or husbands, but if people will be a little patient I am sure the Post Office Department will finally work that out, because I happen to know that the Post Office Department is exerting its utmost not only to expedite the mail to our soldiers but to deliver it as expeditiously as possible. Enough of that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have much respect for theorists, and my idea and my knowledge of warfare is altogether theory. I am unable to offer any constructive legislation to the War Department in order to improve conditions, because I know nothing about it. My whole training in life has been in a different direction. Recently we had some rather unjust and stringent criticisms delivered in the Senate against the operation of the War Department. We have had able replies and answers made to it, not only in the other end of the Capitol but here. But the criticism of the way the War Department is handling the affairs of our country to-day, in a large way, is theoretical, and the men who answered the criticism here and in the Senate, though they are able, are again theorists. I would rather take the word of a man who was on the firing line, who is in the camps training, in the cantonments, on the submarine chasers, or on our dreadnaughts, detailing conditions surrounding those things, than to take the word of the critics, however much more eloquent their word may be than the language of the men who actually know the facts.

There went from my district last summer a young man, a volunteer, a soldier who heard the patriotic call of his country, uneducated except in the school of experience, a graduate with the saw in one hand and a hammer in the other, but imbued with all the fires of patriotism. He has been in the service of his country since last June or possibly last May. This soldier, who has never had the opportunity of becoming a graduate of a school or college, except, as stated, in the school of hard experience, wrote me a letter recently from Camp Shelby, Miss., in answer to some of the criticism that is being made now against the War Department, and in my own time, Mr. Chairman, I ask that this letter be read and made a part of the RECORD.

In one short letter, in his own language, in his own way, and in his own thoughts, he has made a complete answer to all the would-be critics of the Secretary of War. Remember this answer comes from a plain soldier in camp, drilling day in and day out to enable him to do his duty and defend his country when the crucial and acid test comes for him to look into the muzzle of a Krupp gun in the trenches of France in defense of the flag of his country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

ON THE RANGE, February 17, 1918.

Hon. W. E. Cox, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: It is some time since last I bothered you with a letter, but feel like a letter from me at this time in regard to what I've to say may interest you.

Firstly, I will say that our training course is advancing rapidly and I believe our regiment will soon be ready for service abroad, as soon as we can be shipped. I note with great disappointment that many so-called leading statesmen are causing much embarrassment to our military heads with their criticisms of the way our armies have been equipped. Let me tell you, from my own observation in this Camp Shelby, I never seen one case of suffering due to lack of equipment, and as far as ordnance is concerned we have been fully equipped, as far as I can learn, long ago, with the exception of machine guns; and, take it all in all, consider the enormous amount of work to gather, equip, and house this immense army we have gathered in less than a year and send hundreds of thousand across the pond in the orderly and quiet way in which all this miracle was wrought, my words are only those of thanks, praise, and thanksgiving toward the wonderful leaders we are serving under.

I want also to call to your attention that the majority of soldiers are very grateful for the thoughtful way in which our Government prepared ways for them to send part of their pay back home through the allotment process.

And also how deeply thankful we all are for "the war-risk insurance." It truly is the greatest piece of legislation ever enacted for soldiers of any nation in the world, and its liberality is so fine that my poor education makes it impossible to do it justice. It does all it claims and more for the men for whom framed. I can not feel as I do, a penniless man offering the only thing I have to my country, namely, my life and good health; and when I think that this insurance insures my mother and younger brothers a protection in case I may make the supreme sacrifice, and in case I come back a helpless cripple I am independent of a hated pension system, which in my eyes was unjust and graft ridden; and when one considers what this assurance means to men like me, why, I say, some day these men will bless this insurance bill as the greatest thing ever done for mortal man; and let me assure you

that the bill was so popular in our company that every man in it took out \$10,000 worth, and they will all bless the day they did this; and I am glad I was the instrument that made some of these same men take it after first passing it up as a scheme. Some day I may be able to relate many humorous incidents in regard to same.

But there are other more weighty reasons on my mind why I take the liberty to write you, and it is this confounded peace talk that seems to be sweeping our country like wildfire, and our foolish people and press seems to be taking it up and shouting and proclaiming it so loudly from the house tops that I fear it is even doing our Army harm. Why I've had countless brushes with some of these half-brained drafted men who hear so much peace talk that their little brains are not in their training, but planning to go home in three or four months, so you can see what damage, untold damage, this damnable and continuous peace talk is doing. It's dividing our people's attention between preparation for a long hard struggle and a speedy peace. And these same people claim they are very patriotic, and yet fail to see that a peace within a year means nothing else than an insecure peace, for Germany in her present position is using all her energy to get the world to talk peace while yet she sits on her dizzy heights of countless victories, and these people are helping this damnable Kaiser yell peace. My God, are they going to let them yell peace until it actually happens, and leave the world insecure in the hands of these heartless barbarians and autocratic beasts? Are we going to "holler" peace and find ourselves in Russia's plight? Or are we going to stop talking peace and sternly face the long years of bitter struggle that are in front of us, to drive these barbarians from power, and really and truly immortalize those noble words of our great President that democracy might be safe for the world?

Our Government is doing its work so nobly and grand that even the meanest partisans can find but few crumbs to chew upon, but isn't it the duty of every preacher, teacher, and writer, and every professional man to start in a campaign to counteract this peace talk that the Kaiser and his agents are spreading here in America.

You have lots to worry and not too much time to waste, but you, through your influence, can turn many people to talk preparation of a long hard war, of great sacrifice from our people, to really and truly crush out this monster, so, therefore, I took this liberty, hoping you will not think me a dreamer, or will not think it a presumption, but hoping you see it in my light.

I remain, your very grateful and respectful friend,

LEO FISCHER,

*Corporal, Company I, One hundred and fifty-second Infantry,
Camp Shelby, Miss.*

P. S.—We are on the rifle range at present and our regiment had a very beneficial shooting course. We are almost through, and move back to camp soon. Wishing you every success.

LEO FISCHER.

[Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York—how much time?

Mr. LONDON. I do not know; 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], who has been tin panning so long about the eight-hour day, is not here. Either the gentleman from Missouri is a great watchdog of the Treasury, a great statesman and the only statesman and the only man who takes care of the Treasury of the United States, or the head of every department and every member of the Cabinet who has failed to increase the hours to a minimum eight-hour day is an accomplice in a form of graft. I would not have talked about this proposition if an insidious effort had not been made to bring about the permanent lengthening of the working day under the guise of war emergency. Every rule of efficiency requires a shortening of the working day instead of the lengthening of it. The shallowness of the reasoning of the gentleman from Missouri appears in his own words. He has characterized himself better than anyone possibly could when, in reply to the question by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], the question being this:

Does the gentleman think what is paid by private employers necessarily constitutes a fair criterion as to what the Government ought to pay?

The gentleman from Missouri replied:

Then the gentleman is condemning the American Federation of Labor, which is a private employer with the same class-of-office force in the District of Columbia. Why, of course what private employers pay is a criterion, because it fixes the standard of wages. What men pay in the market for potatoes fixes the price of potatoes.

Now, that is exactly what the man who refuses to learn would be expected to say. He would have human labor, he would have the value of human effort, he would have the work of men and women determined by what he calls "the law of supply and demand" supposedly regulating the price of potatoes. He would reduce the human being to the value of a commodity, of an inanimate article, and subject man to the law of supply and demand. I deny that there is a law of supply and demand in which the human agency does not enter as a factor. Every trust, every monopoly limits the operation of the law of supply and demand, and every law, every act of social legislation, every attempt to assert the collective conscience of the people in the direction of an ethical basis in the practices between man and man limits, qualifies, and curbs the operation of the law of supply and demand. There is nothing more absurd than to attempt to apply the law of supply and demand to human relations. There is nothing more iniquitous

than to say to the laboring man, "I shall subject you to the law of supply and demand. If a thousand men apply for a job, I will have them work 14 hours and will pay them \$1 a day, but if 2,000 men apply for the job I will have them work 18 hours a day and pay them 50 cents a day."

It is this law of competition, as it relates to the labor market, that the American professor, Richard T. Ely, designated as the law of the meanest employer. It is the law of the unthinking and unfeeling man. I would recommend the gentleman from Missouri, if that is all the political economy he knows, that so far as the expression "the law of supply and demand" goes the less he will use that expression the better off he will be. It is a rule to which there is no exception that efficiency is brought about by limiting the hours of labor. When you take one hour and multiply it by 8 it does not mean that you have increased the product by 8. It does not mean that in the eight-hour day the eighth hour you can work as effectively, as productively, as diligently, and as fruitfully as during the first hour of the day. You study the law of efficiency—by the way, there is a very scholarly work on the subject by a woman, Josephine Goldmark's *Fatigue and Efficiency*, in which she has compiled opinions from the best authorities in the world on the subject of the result of fatigue upon efficiency. Study statistical tables with respect to accidents and you will discover that accidents occur mostly in the afternoon, and the greater number of accidents occur during the last days of the week. It is in the morning when you are fresh, when you apply yourself with new vigor to your work, that you are most effective. The question is not whether a Government employee works seven or eight hours a day. The question is whether within those seven hours he does the work required of him. That is the question. And, judging even by Mr. BORLAND's own standard that what people will ordinarily do in a community constitutes the standard, the seven-hour day which has existed in the District of Columbia since 1898, has by the practice, custom, and habits of 20 years become the standard of this community, and any attempt to lengthen the working-day is going backwards, is retrograding.

That seems to be the only thing a Democrat can do. If he moves at all, he moves backwards. Let him not claim to be the savior of the Treasury—a great statesman. Noise! Noise! "BORLAND, the savior of the Treasury." He will save Uncle Sam \$7,000,000 a year, while every head of the Cabinet and the head of every department refuses to save to the Treasury these \$7,000,000.

It is about time for the gentleman from Missouri to learn something, to realize that we are not making progress by going backward; that the world's forward march is for shorter hours and higher efficiency and better treatment of every man, and that the Government surely can not afford to be a mean employer.

The only men that will support the gentleman from Missouri in lengthening the hours of labor are those employers who look upon the movement for the reduction of hours of labor as a movement which will ultimately destroy them, the powers of plutocracy, the powers that would destroy every man who sympathizes with the cause of the men and women who work for a livelihood.

You know from your own experience that when you are at your best you are doing in 3 or 4 hours what will take you 8 or 10 hours to do when you are in a state of fatigue, when you are exhausted, when you are tired. Do not measure the value of human labor by the figure "8" or the figure "7." And the contribution which the employee of the Government makes by his seven hours is by the industry, by the intelligence, and the conscientiousness with which he performs the work for which Uncle Sam pays him.

Mr. KEARNS. Why do you say seven hours for the Government clerks. Some of them work 8 or 10 hours.

Mr. LONDON. I am speaking of those departments where they work seven hours to-day. That custom has existed in this city since 1898. It is the custom of the community. It is the practice. It is the standard to which they have become accustomed.

Mr. KEARNS. There is no custom of seven hours in the departments.

Mr. LONDON. I understand that in all the departments in which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] tries to make a change there is.

Mr. KEARNS. His statements do not accord with the facts entirely. The facts are they have to do the work there whether it takes 6 hours or 10 hours or 12 hours.

Mr. LONDON. The work is and should be measured by the product and not by the length of hours taken to perform the work. It is exactly what I am trying to argue; and the

man who pretends he is going to confer a benefit upon the American people—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. LONDON. And the man who pretends he is going to confer a benefit upon the American people or save the money of the Treasury by increasing the hours of labor is talking hot air.

Mr. KEARNS. I happen to know that in the Post Office Department here in Washington there has been an order issued to about 200 girls to come back after 6 o'clock in the evening and work until 10 or 11 o'clock at night. Now, that order has been issued—

Mr. LONDON. Because they are short of help.

Mr. KEARNS. And they are not getting 1 cent additional pay, either.

Mr. LONDON. And I suppose that every one of them does the work willingly, realizing that they are called upon to do this work because of the extraordinary situation in which the country finds itself.

I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] that he begin studying the labor problem. And let him please do away with the talk about supply and demand governing the price of potatoes becoming the law in the relations of human beings. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], who is temporarily absent from the Chamber, has requested that I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] delivered a most interesting address, splendidly expressed, with regard to the coal production of the United States, with some reference to transportation conditions, and the vast increase of exports. Carefully listening to his statements, I gained the impression that most of this was to be accredited to the industrial shutting-down order issued by Dr. Garfield, head of the Fuel Administration, a short time ago. Possibly the gentleman from Illinois did not intend to credit Dr. Garfield with the increase of 64,000,000 tons in our output of bituminous coal last year; possibly did not intend to credit Dr. Garfield with our enormously increased exports and with the partial clearing up of the railway congestion. But such was the impression.

The gentleman from Illinois had a pretty hard task before him, that of attempting to justify the order of the Fuel Administrator which closed down a very large portion of the industry of the country a short time ago. I have no disposition to unduly, certainly I do not desire to captiously, criticize Dr. Garfield. I do not desire to criticize any public official who is acting in good faith, as I have no doubt Dr. Garfield was. The doctor was, I imagine, to a very considerable extent the goat of the railway administration, for even the gentleman from Illinois emphasized the alleged relief of the freight congestion through his order very much more than any relief in the matter of increased supplies of coal. Furthermore, I have no desire to unduly criticize Dr. Garfield, because, I believe, he has unintentionally performed a very great public service.

Unwittingly, no doubt, but nevertheless, he and his order have performed as great a public service as has been performed by any individual or any governmental agency in a long time. For he has again demonstrated, again illuminated, again emphasized the fact known to all thoughtful men and students of history that no government bureaucratic organization can successfully manage the intricate industrial affairs of a great people; that any attempt to regulate or control the industries of a nation through a government bureau is almost certain to result in disaster. It is necessary, it has been necessary in this time of war, to grant great autocratic power. Congress has not granted this authority in the belief that the grant was of itself desirable, but in the belief that under the circumstances and conditions it was necessary and inevitable. In authorizing the exercise of autocratic power Congress has not lost sight of the fact that in the exercise of that power mistakes will be made, unwise things will be done; while we have hoped for the accomplishment of great good we have realized that inevitably harm may be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. When Congress authorized great powers to the Emergency Shipbuilding Corporation does the gentleman believe that it was ever intended for that corporation to commence the publication of a weekly newspaper?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, no; furthermore, I do not believe it was the intent of Congress to have an official court journal published and sent to anyone in the Union who desired it at a time when the supply of print paper was said to be so short and so scarce that the only uncensored journal in the United States, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is not being printed and sent out. That is also true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then these powers having been given, and some newspaper of that kind being printed, and another, as I am told, organized, is there any way it can be prevented—any possible way?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, that is one of the difficulties of a grant of autocratic power. There is always danger that it will be abused, that men whose judgment is not sound or whose purposes are not the best may abuse that power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. When a fuel administrator is looking about for a place to cut off nonessential industries, would it not be a good thing for some of the departments to shut off nonessential side lines of expense?

Mr. MONDELL. Of course. The gentleman knows how dangerous it is to have public sentiment formed, controlled, and molded by official publications, published at public expense to express and reflect the official view.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. So far as I am concerned, I can see no reason for there being a journal published by the Emergency Shipbuilding Corporation except to mold public sentiment in their own interest. I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] what authority he has for the statement that the Emergency Shipbuilding Corporation is going to establish a newspaper?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Only from the statement of a public newspaper here and from the activity of a number of newspaper acquaintances of mine who expect to find employment on the Shipbuilding Corporation's weekly newspaper.

Mr. MONDELL. So many abuses are likely to grow out of the exercise of wide authority that Dr. Garfield has performed a great public service in challenging our attention to the dangers that lie in the granting of great power and authority and autocratic control. I do not know but it is worth all of the great loss and cost, enormous as it has been. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] yesterday called attention to the fact that the people loyally responded and obeyed the order. Certainly they did. No one on this floor ever suggested that they should not. No good citizen ever suggested at any time anywhere that the order should not be obeyed, and the people did obey it, as it was their duty to do, to their great inconvenience, loss, and suffering. The fact that they did obey it, instead of justifying the order, should, on the contrary, teach a lesson and have a sobering effect on those who have great and unusual power, restraining them from exercising it in laying on the people great burdens, great hardships, knowing that their patriotism and law-abiding habit will persuade them to obey, however unjust, arbitrary, and needless it may be. There are a lot of good folks in the country who would try their best to stand on their heads if an order were issued through some officer of the Government to that effect, coupled with the claim that it was necessary for the winning of the war.

Those charged with responsibility ought to be careful as to the sort of orders they issue. As to Dr. Garfield—and I do not want to say anything unkindly of him—I never met him, and I know that he comes from an illustrious family, and I have no doubt he is a well-meaning man. But I can not help thinking of that other doctor that I once heard of, who, lacking experience and training qualifying him to diagnose and cure the ordinary ailments of his patients, adopted the very simple expedient of throwing them into fits, being very confident that he was "death on fits" and could cure that malady. [Laughter.]

One would not think very highly of an engineer put in charge of a great and intricate piece of machinery who, having discovered that there was a little leak of steam, a loosening of the joints, a slipping of the belts, a little troublesome friction, should proceed to try to remedy things by throwing a monkey wrench into the most essential part of the machinery.

The fact is—and the fact can not be changed by any argument made by anyone anywhere—that the fuel order to which reference has been made was a crude, cruel, useless, senseless act. As first issued it was proposed to close down manufac-

turing industries run by water power, to close down industries drawing coal from mines immediately adjacent to the factory. It did close down industries making the very locomotives that were the prime essential to the remedying of the conditions of railway congestion, in aid of which the fuel order was issued.

There was an unfortunate situation; there was a condition requiring some action. But no such drastic, far-reaching, all-embracing act of despotic power was necessary. It led to great loss and suffering, to the shutting down of industries of vast importance to the winning of the war. It deprived American workmen of millions of dollars of wages and entailed a loss of even greater magnitude to American industry. It accomplished nothing that could not have been accomplished with little loss or inconvenience. It would have been very easy indeed to have worked out some plan whereby the situation, bad as it was, might have been cured, rather than this plan, which, in my opinion, has not commended itself to the calm, deliberate, sober, unbiased judgment of a single individual under the flag.

And yet Dr. Garfield, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, has performed a great public service. He has reminded us of the danger of placing in any man's hands great autocratic power. We have felt it necessary in the prosecution of this war to do that. We may find it necessary to do it further. I am frank to say—I am glad to be able to say—that in the main and in many matters of moment this authority has been exercised with discretion and judgment.

It is my opinion that a Member of this House is not performing a service to his country when, having joined in granting great power and authority because it seemed necessary, he feels called upon to indorse, approve, and praise every exercise of the powers so granted, no matter how patently unwise and unjustified it may have been. [Applause.]

While I have the opportunity I desire to say a word about the class of people who have come to be designated as "alien slackers." We are engaged in a war against the powers and pretenses of arbitrary, despotic military despotism. We believe the liberties of mankind, the opportunities for independent, free self-government among men largely depend on the winning of the war.

Our young men, the bravest and best, are freely offering themselves and their lives to the service of their country and mankind. There are many men among us of military age who are citizens of the countries which are battling with us in this great contest. If they were in their native land they would be called into service; but here, under the protection of our flag and enjoying the benefits of our hospitality, they seek the exemption which they claim their foreign birth and citizenship gives them.

All honor to such of those of foreign birth and citizenship—and they are many—who claim no exemption and freely offer themselves for service. As to those who do not, when both the land of their birth and the land that has afforded them asylum, security, and opportunity needs and calls them, some way should be found to bring them to a realizing sense of the fact that he who will not share the burdens and responsibilities of free government is not entitled to its protection and opportunities.

I am in hopes that through treaty, or, failing in that, through legislative action, these slackers may soon be compelled to serve the common cause either under the flag of their native land or under the flag of the land which harbors and protects them. Of all slackers the one we have the least respect for is he who seeks under the cloak of foreign citizenship to escape the service our own boys gladly and patriotically undertake.

I yield back the rest of my time and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not expect to occupy the full 30 minutes allotted to me. I am very glad to take the opportunity to address this very large and enthusiastic gathering of the House, and as I have been subtly reminded, with crowded galleries, on a subject that has not hitherto been discussed, but eventually will receive careful consideration by the people of this country.

We are reminded time and again that the fighting of this great war presents problems new and unique to humanity, new and unique to any nation, and particularly to this Nation of ours that hitherto has been peace loving and isolated so far as

international entanglements were concerned. We find ourselves under the necessity of sending a large army a distance of 4,000 or 5,000 miles to fight the battles of the Republic. As I said on one prior occasion I now repeat, it is the most colossal undertaking ever attempted by any nation since history began. As time speeds by gradually there will be unfolded to us new problems connected with this great enterprise. It is in relation to one of these problems that is soon to arise that I want to speak for a few minutes.

First let me call attention to the fact that the news which came to us this morning indicates that the soldiers of Uncle Sam on the fighting line in France met the severe shock of battle and met it like veterans. [Applause.] They have during recent days been subjected to the supreme test of all the fiendish characteristics of this awful struggle. They have met the test of attack by the most intrepid and powerful soldiers, and the best trained, that the Kaiser has. They have met the test of the cold and the wet and the rain and the snow, privation and hunger. They have met these great tests in a way that thrills the heart of every American patriot. We are not, however, in any sense surprised. It was apparent to every man who journeyed along the western front during the autumn just passed and who saw the various troops fighting among the allies, saw the Belgians, saw the Portuguese, saw the various kind of British troops, saw the French, and later mingled and abided for a time among the soldiers of Uncle Sam, that for physical capacity, for courage, spirit, dash, all the elements that go to make a man a great soldier in this great warfare, the soldiers of the United States who have been trained and are in France are the best in the world. [Applause.] And there are many magnificent soldiers to-day in the world. However, we have a problem which is very, very serious; and I may be permitted to add in this connection that the people in the United States may take a great deal of comfort in the knowledge that our soldiers who in the shock of battle are wounded, or who fall a prey to sickness, are to receive the best treatment that has ever yet been given to soldiers of any nation in time of war.

The Medical Department of our Army and the Red Cross of this country are doing a class of work excellent in its character, inspiring in all its details, and any mother in this country can know to a certainty that if her boy is perchance wounded, or if her boy is taken sick, he is going to have as good treatment in France as though he were at home, as though he were back in the great country he is fighting for. And we ought to observe as we pass that no small degree of credit for this satisfactory condition should be given to the women of the United States. The men of this country have been working and performing great deeds during the period that this war has continued, but we recognize that we have fallen down in many respects. But, thank God, the women of the United States have not. [Applause.] Perhaps we are behind in machine guns, behind in artillery, behind in ammunition, behind in uniforms, behind in ships; but we are ahead in bandages, we are ahead in sweaters, we are ahead in socks, we are ahead in everything that woman was called upon to produce. [Applause.] I have not yet heard of any strikes among the knitting workers of this country. [Applause.] I have not found any strikes among the women who are rolling the millions of bandages that are going to relieve the suffering in Europe. And if you only knew the value of a clean bandage to a boy who is wounded! Any day along the front you may see men in the best armies in Europe who are obliged to undergo the danger that comes from a bandage that is not new and not clean. But our women already have provided and will continue to provide bandages and Red Cross supplies sufficient so that every man may be kept free from septic conditions.

But it is my purpose to speak on an entirely different subject. Life at the front in this war is a new life to civilization. It contains no elements at all to which we have accustomed ourselves through generations of civilizing and Christianizing influences. Men in the trenches are reduced back to primeval conditions. They live in holes in the ground. They work in the mud, they work in the rain, in the snow, in the cold. They suffer from hunger, they suffer from thirst, they suffer from cold, they suffer from all the elements of nature when nature seems to be at her worst. A man must battle against these conditions almost as primeval man battles against them. But in addition he must battle against all the forces of destruction that a vigilant and capable enemy can devise. He is not simply cold, he is not simply suffering from lack of food or lack of clothing or lack of water to drink, but he is in the midst of ever present danger. A little movement to one side, lifting the head above the trench, walking along the communicating trench in a way that he should not, moving along a

highway when he should have been in a trench may mean death to him. The atmosphere is charged with eternal vigilance if a man is going to live.

I realize in all this, no matter how strong a man may be physically, no matter how superb his spirit, he can not stand the wear and tear. There must be a letting up, an opportunity for relaxation. He must be allowed to get out of that hell region, out of the sound of shells, out of the sound of the roar of cannon, away from the danger, away from the cold and suffering, away from life under these awful conditions, and get where there is sunshine, get where there is comfort, get where there are refining influences that he knew in his lifetime, that his whole body may relax and recuperate.

The British recognizing this have perfected an elaborate system of leave. Every day there crosses the English Channel from the British front 10,000 men going back to England on leave. They have a period of rest in England of about 10 days, where they are permitted to enjoy some of the comforts that even exist to-day in England. They get out of that hell-charged atmosphere and the change is fairly complete. There is nothing that can express, there is no person that can express, that exultation of soul which comes to these men as they leave the trenches and know that they are going to Blighty.

I went on a troop ship across the Channel one day, and they filled several trains with troops, and I had a chance to watch them on the train. When we reached London they did not wait for the train to stop, they pried open the doors and leaped out on the platform and yelled, "Blighty at last."

I recall going back over that same route, and after we had landed in France we came up to the British front and saw the boys going back, and these fellows that had been on leave said, "God bless you, you are some lucky dogs." That does not spring from a slacker spirit at all. The British soldiers have the utmost interest and a dogged interest to end the war, and there is just one end, and that is victory, and they do not propose to stop until victory is achieved. [Applause.] There is no sacrifice too great to make without grumbling, but they realize the necessity of having frequent relaxation. They give the men leave once in four or five months. They are carrying that out pretty well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. About how often does the gentleman say the British soldier receives leave to go to England?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. They intend to give him leave once in four months, but are not always able to do it exactly on time, so that it is four or five months. In the French army we have the same situation.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Before the gentleman leaves that subject I think perhaps Members might get the impression that these soldiers were compelled to stay in the trenches until they made the trip to England. That is not the fact, is it?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; they never stay in the trenches more than 10 or 12 days, or perhaps 2 weeks, and then they have a period off.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They are supposed to be six days in the trenches, are they not?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That depends on the activity in the trenches. In France we find the same custom. There they give the men leave every 90 days, and they go home on permission. It is not any injustice to the French soldier, nor does it do him any lack of credit to say that he looks forward to the period home with a great deal of interest. In fact, I am told that should you deny to the British and French Army this opportunity of relaxation to which I have called attention the morale of the army would decline enormously, and it would be a difficult thing to keep them up to concert pitch.

The Germans themselves have a system somewhat of the character I have briefly outlined, but just pause for a minute and reflect how simple a problem for England and France. Soldiers of the British in France can leave the trench, and on the following day they are in Blighty. They can even leave the trench in the morning, if officers are lucky enough to catch a ride back on some lorry returning from the front—they can get to London that night. French soldiers can leave anywhere along the front line and get to their homes that same evening, no matter where it may be in France, or, at most, on the following day.

Our men are going to be subjected to the same severe trials. They are now subjected to the same severe trials and living conditions. They will have to have relaxation. Where are we going to provide it for them. That's a tremendous problem that disturbs many of our officers in France. Nobody has yet

found a solution. There are two or three things, however, that by elimination will enable us to work out the problem as far as its consideration is concerned. First, we can not send them to London or England; second, we can not send them to Paris, nor can we permit them to go to Paris or any other large city. Manifestly they can not be brought home to the United States. In this connection I might observe that I mingled with a good many Australians and New Zealanders among the British troops, and I found the only cause of complaint—they did not care a rap about Gallipoli or the losses they sustained—the only thing that bothered them was that they did not have a home to go to every five months.

Great Britain is doing her level best to accomplish something in relief for the men, and the Canadians have the same situation that the New Zealanders and the Australians have. They are trying their best—the British Government—to bring relief by sending these men to England and permitting them to go in some parts of France.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Has there been any consideration given to having some recreation point in Switzerland available to American soldiers?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. There has; and I shall be pleased to mention that briefly in a moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, it might be interesting to add at this point that at one time in crossing the channel I saw a small shipload of Christmas cards and newspapers furnished by the Australian Government to the Australian soldiers living in France, post cards from the Government to the soldiers.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes. That is a splendid testimony of the interest the Government itself takes in her sons, something that we might well emulate. Coming down to the problem of the United States, it is not necessary to state how many soldiers we have in France. We have enough, and some of them have been there now for eight months. We all know that it is our aim to get there a million and a half, at least, as soon as we can. It is my firm conviction that by the time the middle of 1919 shall arrive we will have more than 3,000,000 men in France. If you are going to give these men leave every four or five or six months, you can readily estimate the large number that must be accommodated while on leave. Some of the ways that have been suggested to give relaxation to the men we might enumerate, and, first, that to which the gentleman from Missouri has just alluded. It was suggested that our soldiers might go to the Alps, in Switzerland, where in the winter season they could have tobogganning and skiing and in the summer season Alpine climbing, but that is just what they do not want. They do not want to climb mountains, because they have been having all the hard physical exertion that they want. They do not want to go sleigh riding or skiing, because they have been buffeting their faces against the storms of snow for weeks and months already. They want to get away from that. It was then suggested that you might have a large number of sort of Cook's tours, so the men could be grouped together and taken on itinerant journeys through France, showing them the places of historic interest. Believe me, they do not care about those places of historic interest, at least not now. That would be the worst conceivable thing to inflict upon them. That gives them no rest. It might take them away from the sound of shells and take them from some of the awful conditions under which they are living, but it does not give them that relaxation and rest to which they are entitled. I with hesitancy present a plan which is mostly my own, but was suggested in its origin by certain of our officers in France who have been giving a considerable amount of their time to a study of this question. There is a place in France where relaxation can be had, and I call your attention to the southeastern part called the Riviera, near Cannes and Nice.

What attracted my attention to that first, having this in mind, was that I learned nearly all those magnificent hotels about Cannes and Nice are closed, shut up. A very few are open and accommodations given to certain of our officers, who have been down there, and certain others who could afford it, and the expense of the trip even to-day on a small individual scale is ridiculously low. I found on inquiry that undoubtedly those hotels could be operated in such a way as to give men good accommodations with all the comforts they could ask for, for not to exceed \$1.50 a day. That region possesses just the qualifications needed for these men.

Mr. COX. Is that a resort of some kind?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It used to be a great watering place, but now it is closed, and gentlemen might be interested

to know that all of the people who used to flock to France and Switzerland and other places, to these watering places and resorts, are not there now. They are not allowed there.

Mr. COX. I suppose these places are closed on account of the war?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. On account of the war entirely; but the buildings and the plants are there.

Mr. MADDEN. Who has control of the Mediterranean?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Our allies have control of the Mediterranean up to date, and we expect to keep control. This is entirely safe here. That is a long distance from the German lines, and we hope it will never be any nearer the German lines than it is now. There is no reason on earth why the hotels there could not be taken over on a large scale, all of them, and a 25-mile zone established around that area, a military zone to keep out all undesirables. Those hotels could be opened and fitted and operated as a place for these men to go, and we could make it a second Atlantic City, if you like. I would give them all the foolishness their hearts might desire, and especially have some of the things that I know our boys want. They can play athletic games there every day of the year, for even during winter the climate is balmy and clear. Readily you can see there is opportunity for boating and all kinds of rowing and racing. There is opportunity for baseball every day of the year, and opportunity for football and any kind of outdoor sport you might name, track athletics, everything. The area is sufficiently large to accommodate any number that might be required to go there, and I think it ought to be done. I do not know that our Government will quite undertake the job. It ought to, but we are the slowest people in the world ever to undertake anything of this character.

We look after hogs and cattle and horses and cows and now and then sheep, but when it comes to the comforts and health of human beings, that is not a governmental function. It is each man for himself and the devil take the hindmost, usually, and I do not know that we can ever get our Government to do it; but it can be accomplished in another way. Already the American Red Cross has found it easy to raise \$100,000,000, and it is going to raise another hundred million dollars, and every man who puts a dollar into that fund can feel that it is going to a splendid purpose. But this is not a job for the American Red Cross. This should be a job for an independent association, and if there are some American people who desire to put their money where it will do the most good in comfort for the men, let them organize an association, and the capital should run into millions, because this is no small job, and let them take over something of this character and perfect it.

Now, I come to the most important feature of all, and I say it with some deliberation and with all the earnestness I can command. These men at the war front after a period of time are longing for a touch of home life, that touch only woman can give. There is something about the war life that calls men to chivalric thought, calls them to an ideal state, one in which they long for a glimpse of pure, sweet womanhood. They need to know there is that sweetness in life which only the presence of woman can give. In these hotels, which should be rigorously controlled and operated, there should be a home touch, and American womanhood that already has shown its capacity wherever called upon can here perform a signal service. Under a careful system of matronage something akin to home influences can be provided.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Women of especial matronly qualities, with the assistance of such young ladies as might be called into the service, trained and discreet, should undertake this work and give the touch of home influence to these places.

Mr. MADDEN. That could, of course, be done under the direction of the Government, and should be done under the direction of the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I was about to say it should be put under the exclusive control of Gen. Pershing, where it belongs.

Mr. MADDEN. And at the expense of the Government of the United States?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Entirely; because the Government ought to do it at its own expense. I am not certain it will or not; but if the Government will not, private individuals should.

Mr. MADDEN. Why should private individuals ever be called upon for that purpose? The governments of other countries are doing it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. They are.

Mr. MADDEN. Why should not this Government be just as generous as any other Government in the world, and I think we are.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. We ought to do so.

Mr. MADDEN. The men who are sitting here have the decision on that question, have not they?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Then let us do it.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Why does the gentleman think this Government would not do it, because it is the right thing for the Government to do?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But the Government is very slow about taking up matters of this character.

Mr. BUTLER. As the gentleman from Illinois said, it could originate here, and there are certainly enough red-blooded men in this House to do this thing.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I hope it will be done and done speedily, and you have no idea what it will mean. For instance, men coming back every four or five months, a team will play a football match, they will play baseball matches, have field events, have races, have tennis matches, going on all the while. Why, it is the greatest opportunity in the world for the development of athletes and clean manhood. Life there can be made so attractive that the men will look forward to it with the keenest anticipation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course the hotel system runs a great many miles along the coast there?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It does.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know how many men the hotels that are there would accommodate, but a large number, but the chances are if our men on the other side amount to 3,000,000, and they are relieved every four months, that would mean a million men on furlough.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. There would not be that many, of course.

Mr. BUTLER. Fighting men.

Mr. MADDEN. Suppose you would not have accommodations for a million men in all the hotels along the Mediterranean coast?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Oh, no.

Mr. MADDEN. We could provide means by which they could be accommodated easily enough.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I should suggest we ought to make provision for about 250,000 at a time, ultimately, for I think that would be as many as we would ever be called upon to have there, and during another year accommodations for fifty or sixty thousand would be ample, and it is something that needs immediate attention.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman introduced a bill of this character?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I have not.

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman will and press it. I think he can get enough men behind it to put it through.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am very thankful to the gentleman for his cooperative suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARLAND. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. GARLAND. As to whether the gentleman knows that there has been action of that kind taken by the Government or intended action?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Not on a comprehensive scale; no.

Mr. GARLAND. I remember three or four weeks ago I went up there with others to get passports for parties going over. We were informed that there was an intention, and especial intention, to establish what is known as an American city down on the Riviera along this very coast.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That was discussed somewhat last fall when I was over, but no adequate plan has ever been attempted or even conceived of. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. May I have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee for a moment? There is one other gentleman here to whom I would like to yield five minutes. The gentleman asked for it some time ago, and I promised it to him. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT], and that will be the last speech under general debate.

Mr. FOCHT. The excellent speech of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], who visited European points, has been accepted with great unanimity, due to the patriotic spirit which prevails throughout this House as well as the country, and I am confident that what he has suggested

is workable and would have the support of this House and the Nation.

The other subject discussed here to-day related to a matter that to my mind is next in importance in maintaining the morale of the troops in Europe to that of giving them entertainment while there. On account of the impossibility of their being able to come home on a furlough communication with the home folks, with the home family, with the fireside should be free, frequent, and unbroken. There is nothing that would inspire and thrill a soldier more than the martial music and the patriotic airs of his home country than a letter from the fireside he left when he went forth to battle for his home. A suggestion was offered this morning by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] and other gentlemen, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] among them, and a spirit not of criticism—far from it—but from a desire to bring about a correction with regard to the transmission of mail to and from our soldiers in Europe. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] said that the failure to make a distribution of mail might be on account of the language in France and it may have been due to the inability to promptly land the letters and the packages. But in support of what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] said, and that it might be understood that these distressing and intolerable conditions exist, I would like to have the Clerk read a letter from a gentleman who would do anything but criticize, who is a distinguished scholar, a gentleman and a patriot, whose son is in France to-day fighting for his country. I wish to have the Clerk read this letter from President Warfield, of Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

WILSON COLLEGE,
Chambersburg, Pa., February 18, 1918.

MY DEAR MR. FOCHT: Individually and as president of one of Pennsylvania's colleges I have endeavored to boost and not to knock, to support the Government and to abstain from criticism. But there comes a time when patriotism seems to mean to correct as well as to promote the activities or inactivities of the Government.

The outcry on behalf of the boys in France a short time ago was so entirely expressive of my own experience that I venture to ask your interest in so stirring up those who administer the mails as to secure for our boys at the front the enjoyment of the many efforts that are put forth for their happiness.

That they are not getting their letters or packages I know from the experience of my own boy and what he writes me of those who are with him. My family is a large one and my son in France has been sent several letters every week and a large number of packages, beginning about November 1. Some of the packages that arrived had been plundered of their contents, and the poignancy of this kind of disappointment only those who have served at the front are able to understand.

He complained in October that he was not able to keep his feet warm or to get warm socks in France. I sent him a large package from Philadelphia on November 3, which I know was properly addressed, and it had not reached him January 12.

He writes:

"December 25: We had a very nice Christmas, though I have not had a letter for six weeks and no package has arrived, but I will keep my eye open and have a long Christmas, extended through the 'guerre,' if necessary."

"January 17: Letters are rare things here. I have had only one from you all winter, in December, one from papa, and only one from E., so that altogether, adding the wet, rainy weather, I feel like 'going out in the garden to eat worms.' But that, I fear, would not be economical as long as I have received one box of books and one box of chocolates, and you say others are coming."

A large number of magazines have been regularly sent, none of which has reached him except an occasional number of the Independent. Among the magazines which have been sent and which have not reached him are the Red Cross, Literary Digest, National Geographic, Harper's, Scribner's and others. Packages of books, packages of chocolates—only two out of many have been received intact—knit goods, sweater, helmet, socks.

Many of these things have only been intended for recreation and relief from the strain of service, but some of them have been to replace the inadequate clothing supplied by the Government.

What I feel for my boy tens of thousands are feeling for their boys—and they are all "our boys."

Yours, very truly,

E. D. WARFIELD.

Hon. BENJAMIN K. FOCHT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOCHT. I wish but a second to say that I have submitted this letter in order that the country may know the conditions that prevail in specific instances and that it is not some vague and unsupported rumor we are discussing.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks made to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

SENATE.

For compensation of Senators, \$720,000.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wanted to say a few words only along the lines of effi-

ciency and the getting out of work during this war in the shipyards and in all the operations that have been taken over and taken charge of by the Government.

It will be well remembered that in the Sixty-fourth Congress when these several large appropriation bills passed with reference to Navy work and Army work that onto each of them was hitched an amendment providing that no man should be required to work on the time-measuring system, and that the system then established in the navy yards be abolished. And I charge it largely to the impracticability of the Democratic side, and among others, I believe, too, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLAND], who, I think, voted in that particular way and who now proposes to get more efficiency from the employees by increasing the number of hours of labor. But there is no other thing as efficient as giving men piece or tonnage work in shops and mills and factories. And I speak from absolute experience.

Only about three weeks ago, I think it was, an article appeared in the Washington Post, of several columns in length, deploring the fact that in every shipyard of the United States the output had "fallen way off," and further stating this fact: That the average number of rivets driven by an individual prior to the war and the taking over of these works by the Government, or, rather, the supervision of them, was 350 per day, and that the same individuals were now driving but 130 rivets per day, a falling off of from 350 to 130. Now, at the time these measures were up it was conceded that there would have to be some effort to try to incite work, although the necessity for it did not seem as plain as now. But the gentlemen on that side, almost to a man, stood up and voted to eliminate the right to reward men for work on piecework. Now, a man that is working in these shipyards must have some incitement to cause him to work, or else he will not do all that he can do, and it is true we need the output and we want the men to be content. The prices of living are advancing all the time, and by having the right to work on piece or tonnage work and not adding one minute more to the hours of employment, it would increase the output in that way and in the direction I have just stated. I have seen time and again in factories and in mills going from the use of the day's work to that of output, where the increase, starting at \$40 a month—and this is in railroad shops—ran up to \$65 a month in less than two months, and shortly after doubled. That is an established fact in some shops over in the State from which I come.

I think there is where the last Congress erred very much; and it seems to me if we want to remedy this matter, if we want to get the output, if we want to stop strikes, if we want to have the men content, we should permit the practice that was in force before the passage of the decision against it by the last Congress.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is making, to me, a very interesting and instructive statement. As I understand the gentleman now, he is taking the position of favoring the pieceworkers?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes, sir; and I did at that time.

Mr. FOCHT. Bonus.

Mr. GARLAND. It is not bonus; it is piecework.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. What is the position of organized labor on that? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. GARLAND. It varies. A large number of the organizations favor and use piecework entirely. The trade to which I belonged, that of iron and steel workers, uses tonnage work. It has always done it.

Mr. COX. What is the policy in that regard of the organization known as the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. GARLAND. It has no decided policy, except that some of our trades affiliated with the American Federation of Labor prefer daywork and decide for that. As a matter of fact, that is where the mistake came in here. They do not declare in any of their conventions for entire daywork. Some of the organizations, I believe—among which are the machinists and others—do declare for daywork only.

Mr. COX. If I recall correctly, the American Federationist, the paper or organ of the American Federation of Labor, when this contest was going on heretofore in regard to the stop-watch system, stated that the test of the friendship of Members of Congress was soon to come on the vote on the stop-watch question.

Mr. GARLAND. There was not a resolution of the American Federation of Labor as a whole asking Congress to vote against it that I am aware of.

Mr. COX. It was stated that piecework had a tendency to overspeed the men and affected their physical endurance, and things like that. What does the gentleman think of that?

Mr. GARLAND. I do not think it does. It is claimed that situation occurred down here under what is known as the Taylor system. As a matter of fact, no one can determine the cost of operation of making a single article in iron or steel or any other article in any other line of manufacture unless they measure it by some kind of time and wage computation, and the attempt at that time was not to permit the use of the clock and thereby determine the cost of an article. I claim that by using a system of piecework you can more readily and more fully determine the cost of the production of an article. But it seems to me the Democrats were so intent on taking the industry of armor-plate making from the State of Pennsylvania they did not want that kind of legislation.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is correct. I want to say to the gentleman that in my little town there are three desk factories, and the ambition of every man working there is to be put on piecework, where they get seven or eight dollars a day. When a man gets to doing piecework he is not overworked at all.

Mr. GARLAND. A man used to drive 350 rivets as an average day's output before the war in these shipyards, but owing to its being Government work and owing to the laws passed by the Sixty-fourth Congress, which I have already explained here, they went onto the basis of daywork, and the same authority in the newspaper article I referred to says that they are now driving 130 rivets a day and consider that a day's work.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question, inasmuch as he is regarded in Pennsylvania as the fountain to which we go on the labor question. I would like to know what the distinction is as to the piecework method and the bonus system which is in operation where they are making shells for the Government. As I understand, they pay them \$3 a day for a whole day, and a certain percentage above a certain number of shells that they grind. How does that relate to this policy in regard to the piecework system, which you say they were prohibited from using at a certain time? I know that they are working on the bonus system in Government work.

Mr. GARLAND. On daywork they do a day's work irrespective of the amount turned out. If they are working on piecework, they agree to pay them on the piecework plan, and that, I insist, incites a man to greater effort; he does more work and not one minute more of labor.

Mr. ROBBINS. They work the same length of time?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes. They work the same length of time, but it keeps them from loafing on the job. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing letters from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior respecting proposed water-power legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the document indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I did not understand what the document was.

Mr. SIMS. It is a letter from the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture respecting proposed water-power legislation, addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is an official document.

Mr. WALSH. Has it not been included in the hearings?

Mr. SIMS. No. I have just received it. The hearings have not been commenced.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

WASHINGTON, February 27, 1918.

Hon. T. W. SIMS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR Mr. SIMS: It is understood your committee will take action at an early date upon various proposals which have been made concerning water-power legislation. On account of the conditions now affecting the power industry and the need of maintaining our entire industrial machinery at its highest efficiency, a satisfactory solution of the water-power problem is, in our judgment, one of the most important steps for the consideration of this Congress and one which should receive attention at the earliest practicable date.

The industrial expansion which has been necessary in order to produce the materials and equipment needed in the prosecution of the war has placed unprecedented demands upon the electric-power industry, to such an extent in fact that the output of commercial central stations has increased more than 60 per cent since 1914. This increase has been greatest in the manufacturing sections of the East where water-power development is comparatively limited, and has been chiefly in the

form of steam-generated power, because steam power can be developed more quickly and at less capital cost than water power. This increase in power output has taken place notwithstanding advances in costs of construction and of operation.

While the form of bill which has been presented for your consideration is directly concerned with water-power development only, an adequate solution of this problem will have a favorable and stabilizing effect upon the whole power industry. Probably no considerable increase in new water-power development can be expected immediately, but legislation is urgently needed in order to put existing water-power developments, which have been made under inadequate law, into a position of security which will enable them to make extensions and to meet maturing obligations upon favorable terms.

There is also need of legislation in order that time may be given to prepare for the developments that must take place after the close of the war, if the United States is to maintain its proper place in world trade, or even to supply its domestic needs. A survey of our water-power resources is needed, particularly with relation to specific districts and specific industries. The various establishments of the Federal Government which have had to do with the administration of water power should be coordinated through a single agency, and as far as practicable all agencies, Federal, State, and private, should be brought into cooperation. It is urgently recommended that a Federal power commission be established as provided in the proposed bill and be given ample authority to undertake this work of preliminary investigations.

Beyond the need of power development as such is the need of increasing the proportion of water power in order to reduce the drain on our coal and petroleum supplies, particularly the latter. Even if the coal supply were unlimited, the reduction in the demands upon labor and transportation equipment would be sufficient reason for substituting water power for steam power whenever possible. The petroleum supply, particularly in the West where the greatest proportion is used for fuel, is being rapidly depleted, consumption has exceeded production and stocks in storage are fast disappearing. With the substitution of water power for steam power in central stations and with the electrification of railroads, a large part of the use of petroleum for fuel could be eliminated.

Water-power legislation should have in view not only the maintenance of the rights of the public in the national resources, but also the adequate protection of private capital by which such resources are developed. The bill before you aims to do both. After careful consideration, however, it is believed that certain changes in language could be made which would more clearly express the intent of the proposed legislation.

It is particularly important that the conditions which affect the disposition of the property at the termination of the license should be so definite that uncertainties will be reduced to a minimum. If the properties are not taken over, the conditions under which a new license may be secured should be entirely clear. If the properties are taken over, the price to be paid should not include alleged values not represented by investment, or, on the other hand, require needless amortization of capital during the period of the license in order to protect the investment. It is, therefore, believed advisable to define in specific language the items which should or should not enter into the price to be paid. The following definition which it is recommended should be inserted at the end of section 3 has been prepared after thorough consideration and after consultation with accounting and banking experts. It is believed to be eminently fair from the point of view of the public and of the investor. The use of this term will require certain changes in other parts of the bill, particularly section 14:

"Net investment" in a project means the actual legitimate original cost thereof as defined and interpreted in the 'Classification of investment in road and equipment of steam roads, issue of 1914, Interstate Commerce Commission, plus similar costs of additions thereto and betterments thereof, minus the sum of the following items properly allocated thereto, if and to the extent that such items have been accumulated during the period of the license from earnings in excess of a fair return on such investment: (a) Unappropriated surplus, (b) aggregate credit balances of current depreciation accounts, and (c) aggregate appropriations of surplus or income held in amortization, sinking fund, or similar reserves, or expended for extensions or betterments. The term 'cost' shall include, in so far as applicable, the elements thereof prescribed in said classification, but shall not include expenditures from funds obtained through donations by States, municipalities, individuals, or others."

The language of section 6, which fixes the period of the license, has been changed somewhat in order to make its intent more clear and in order to make certain that there shall be no time when the holder of a license may not have the privilege of receiving a new license if the properties are not taken over either by the United States or by a new licensee.

Certain other changes, minor in character, have been made for the purpose of clarifying the language or improving the form of the bill. All these changes are shown upon the attached copy of the confidential committee print.

-Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.
FRANKLIN K. LAND,
Secretary of the Interior.
D. F. HOUSTON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Secretary: Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$6,500; assistant secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$3,250; financial clerk, minute and Journal clerk, principal clerk, and enrolling clerk, at \$3,000 each; reading clerk, \$3,600; executive clerk, and assistant financial clerk, at \$2,750 each; librarian, file clerk, chief bookkeeper, assistant Journal clerk, and printing clerk, at \$2,500 each; first assistant librarian, and keeper of stationery, at \$2,400 each; assistant librarian, \$1,800; skilled laborer, \$1,200; clerks—3 at \$2,500 each, 4 at \$2,220 each, 2 at \$2,100 each, 1 \$1,800, 2 at \$1,600 each, 1 \$1,440; assistant keeper of stationery, \$2,000; assistant in stationery room, \$1,200; messenger, \$1,440; assistant messenger, \$1,200; laborers—3 at \$840 each, 3 at \$720 each, 1 in stationery room \$720; in all, \$94,410.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this morning in the general debate two Members of the House came valiantly to the defense of the profiteers in Washington who are the beneficiaries of the seven-hour law, and they did me the honor to refer rather pointedly to me in person. One of them was the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] and the other the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Now, as to the gentleman from New York, I have always had the misfortune since he has been a Member of this House of not being able to communicate with him. For some reason or other he and I do not speak the same language. I have never been able to arrive at his mental processes. It may be my misfortune. If so, I am too old to change, but I do not either read, speak, or understand the bolshevik language, so that I am at loss to discuss his proposition. [Laughter.]

But it is quite otherwise with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I think I understand clearly what he says. The gentleman from Tennessee has had a unique reputation in this House, and I rather think, if I am not mistaken, that he has somewhat gloried in it. He has taken the position, as I understand, that he never votes against any appropriation and never votes for any tax. By some strange system of magic all of these beautiful expenditures that he is in favor of come out of a clear blue sky, and none of them come out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. None of them represents the sweat and blood of our constituents, according to his beautiful optimistic ideas and statements. I wish I could subscribe to them.

He never wants to levy a tax on the American people. He wants the other Members of Congress to do that; but he always wants to vote for an appropriation. Now, that is a very beautiful theory. It is a good rule to go by, but, like all rules, there are exceptions. They say it takes an exception to prove the rule, and this particular rule of the gentleman from Tennessee has had one conspicuous exception. In the 10 years I have served with him I have never known him to vote against any appropriation except one, and that was the appropriation for the investigation of the Beef Trust. When the appropriation came before this House for the investigation of the Beef Trust, that had the American farmer by the throat, the gentleman from Tennessee voted against that appropriation. Why, he not only voted against it, but he worked with feverish energy over here at the door as his colleagues were coming in to vote on the floor. He was determined to beat that investigation. That is the sole exception that I know of. Now, I do not know how the gentleman is going to explain to his farmer constituents in eastern Tennessee why they should work 12 and 14 hours a day in the field to support seven-hour clerks in Washington, but I understand even less how he is going to explain to his farmer constituents why, when he never votes against an appropriation—

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. What right has the gentleman to discuss the previous votes or conduct of the gentleman from Tennessee on a motion to strike out the last word of this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order against the gentleman's remarks?

Mr. KEARNS. I do.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must proceed in order.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Mr. KEARNS. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. To which objection is made.

Mr. BORLAND. I will endeavor to proceed in order.

Mr. BUTLER. Can you do it?

Mr. BORLAND. I can. I would not refer by name to any gentleman in this House. I want simply to explain the necessity and bearing and some of these expenses that we are now levying on the American people. I have noticed, however, that there are a certain class of gentlemen in the House who always come valiantly to the rescue whenever the special interests are attacked.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the gentleman mean by that—"when special interests are attacked"?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, that is not a question of order. If the gentleman will pardon me, I have been held down here to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. There is nothing before the House dealing with "special interests."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri must speak, of course, with reference to what is before the committee. The Chair would not hold that a reference to "special interests" was out of order, but as the Chair understands, the gentleman has made no motion.

Mr. BORLAND. I moved to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman must speak to that.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman must speak to the motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. BORLAND. Gentlemen are getting very sensitive on that side of the House. I do not blame them, but I am very glad to say that I do not refer to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Illinois needs no defense from the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri must proceed in order.

Mr. BORLAND. I renew my request to speak for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for five minutes to speak out of order. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] has returned to the Hall of the House. I renew my request to speak for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. I hope the request will be granted, and I regret I was not here to hear the gentleman's interesting talk.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman from Tennessee requests that the gentleman from Missouri be given the time, of course I am not going to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? No objection is heard. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I regret also that the brilliant gentleman from Tennessee was not present when I began my remarks. I was discussing his attitude toward appropriations and expenditures in this House, and I recalled the fact that during our service here, which has been equal in length of time, my understanding has been that he never voted against an appropriation and never voted for a tax; but I called attention to one conspicuous exception to that rule. That was the appropriation made in this House for the investigation of the Beef Trust. In that particular instance the gentleman overstepped his usual rule and voted against the appropriation.

As I say, it may be somewhat difficult, to my mind, for the gentleman to explain to the farmers of eastern Tennessee why they should be taxed for seven-hour clerks in Washington.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. No; I regret I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BORLAND. But it would seem more difficult to my mind to explain to them why, in view of the revelations which have come out in regard to the activity of the swarm of attorneys for the Beef Trust who were here in Washington, the gentleman from Tennessee should vote against that particular appropriation when he was universally in favor of all other appropriations. I said that whenever the special interests were attacked in this House there were always gentlemen ready to come to their defense, whether it was the profiteers of Washington or any other class.

How sweet to hear the watchdog's honest bark
Bay deep-mouthed welcome as we draw near home.

[Applause.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House for five minutes. I regret that I am unable to answer that part of the gentleman's [Mr. BORLAND'S] speech, which was delivered in my absence from the floor of the House. I believe the gentleman was present this morning when I discussed him, and attempted in my feeble way to answer his observations of yesterday. In reference to his statement that I never vote against an appropriation, although I began pledging myself to enormous expenditures of money under the spell of his magic while on that wonderful Mississippi River trip—\$230,000,000 at the very beginning of our acquaintance—I want to tell him that on several occasions here in the House I have voted against appropriations. I voted against the appropriation giving the Members of the House of Representatives their mileage; that is, I voted in favor of putting it on the actual amount expended rather than the 20 cents per mile basis. I do not know how the economist from Missouri voted on that proposition and I do not care.

This proposition about investigating the Beef Trust—I think the gentleman will find in the RECORD that I have consistently opposed and voted against all the so-called Democratic investigations from the Sixty-second Congress down to the present Congress, which I considered simply a waste of time and the public money in order to furnish gentlemen on that side for partisan purposes campaign material and not to advance the interests of the taxpayers.

The Beef Trust investigation was a proposition to investigate the high cost of living; that was the propaganda and the argument made in the House of Representatives. I took the position that all we needed to stop the high-cost-of-living prices was the enforcement of present laws and the indictment by the Federal grand jury of the packers and other people who were attempting to oppress the people; that we were paying for the expenses of the necessary prosecuting attorneys and assistant prosecuting attorneys who had access to Federal grand juries, and instead of wasting this money—\$250,000—to furnish jobs for Democratic office seekers we should put the district and assistant attorneys appointed by President Wilson to work in the Department of Justice and in every Federal courthouse in the United States to investigate before the grand juries the doings of the packers and all other people who were seeking to advance the price of the necessities of life and who were outraging the American people rather than to dissipate the money and time in a political investigation originated by the gentleman in favor of cattle raisers in his district for whom he seemed to be the special champion.

The Clerk read as follows:

For captain, \$1,800; 3 lieutenants, at \$1,200 each; 2 special officers, at \$1,200 each; 47 privates, at \$1,050 each; 10 additional privates, at \$840 each; one-half of said privates to be selected by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and one-half by the Sergeant at Arms of the House; in all, \$65,550.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Under this item for Capitol police is there any provision for these so-called Capitol guides, or are they anywhere taken care of in this bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are not.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. What are the duties of Capitol guides with regard to being in any sense under the control of the authorities in charge of the Capitol?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are permitted, as I understand it, to act as guides here in the Capitol under a permit which they receive, and they are permitted to receive such compensation as is given them by those who employ them.

Mr. DYER. Who gives the permit to these gentlemen?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed that the Sergeant at Arms of the House and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate jointly issue these permits. Probably one issues one half of them and the other the other half.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Do the Sergeants at Arms have any authority of law for this, or is it a long-established practice and custom that they are following?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is a custom that has obtained for many years, and I assume that they have taken jurisdiction of it, because they have jurisdiction in the Capitol.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Of course my remarks should not be interpreted as meaning that I hint that there is anything wrong on the part of those who have followed the practice or custom, but it gives me this opportunity to suggest to the gentleman's committee, with his permission, that it seems to me there is something strangely inconsistent in the administration of a democratic form of government when a citizen who comes to this Capitol has to pay 25 cents to see his own building.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is, of course, not necessary unless he desires to do it.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is what he does.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If he wishes to go through the building without an escort, he can go through.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand that; and yet, by way of contrast, at the Treasury Department, for instance, when the visitor presents himself—and that is his building, too, in the same general sense—he is met by a guide who takes him about and shows him his own property.

Mr. MADDEN. He could not steal anything up here except a Member of Congress, and they do not care if he does do that.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, there have been repeated attempts to get these guides put on the pay roll, and a great many arguments have been urged in favor of it, among others the argument of the gentleman from Vermont, that the public ought to have free service. Of course, the public does not have to pay those guides unless it chooses to do so. The build-

ing is free and it is policed. The guides are supervised by the Sergeant at Arms, and they are kept in order and their fees are kept within limits and they are respectable, law-abiding men. That is the only object in licensing them.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The guides will not show a man through unless they are paid.

Mr. BORLAND. It is a fee which is voluntarily given on the part of the visitors; but it is apparent that if the guides were put on the pay roll and paid a salary, and distributed around as patronage among the Members, that exactly the same thing would occur that now occurs in respect to the barbers. A Member of Congress who patronizes the barber shop pays the same price exactly for the service that he would have paid if the man was not on the public pay roll. The only difference is that the public pays an additional price. That would be the only difference here in the practical operation of it. For a short time there might be free service given by a few guides, but you can not prevent the American public from tipping that class of service. You can not prevent it by law or in any other way, and the public would begin to do it and it would become a custom.

Mr. DYER. Can not you prevent the guide from accepting it?

Mr. BUTLER. Is it impossible to put the obligation upon the American Republic?

Mr. BORLAND. But you can not prevent the public from giving the quarter extra.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman understand that tipping is an absolute necessity?

Mr. BORLAND. Some believe it is a necessity.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It seems to me absolutely belittling the dignity and majesty of this Government and all of its theories of democratic ownership and equality of rights of the owners that when a man comes here from across the continent, maybe, to see the property he has been told by the school books he owns, he is held up at the door of the great Capitol of this great Nation and has to pay a quarter to see it.

Mr. BORLAND. No. He is not held up at the door.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It is a distinction in terms and not in effect; in language, and not in what it amounts to the pocketbook. That is all. Even if it is true that the visitor has his option of paying or not paying to have the features of interest in his own Capitol shown to him and explained to him, the fact is that if he does not pay he is not shown them and they are not explained, while other people, willing to pay and having the money to pay, have all that courtesy extended to them. I believe that some arrangement should be made whereby guides, paid by the Government, shall regularly conduct parties of sightseers about the Capitol Building without exacting any fees from the visitors themselves.

Mr. BORLAND. If we had the guides on the pay roll the man whom the guide suspected would not tip would not find a guide. There might be plenty of guides, but he could not find them.

Mr. MADDEN. Does this illustrate what would happen in the case of great business enterprises controlled by the Government?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman in charge of the bill with reference to the item on page 10, beginning line 10, in reference to the automobile provided for the Vice President. Can the gentleman state how long the present automobile has been in use?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It was purchased in July, 1914, nearly four years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move an amendment, on page 11, line 12, after the second word "each," to strike out "one-half" and all of lines 13 and 14 and insert "said privates to be selected by the Superintendent of the Capitol."

Mr. FOSTER. I reserve a point of order on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOOD. It is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it is or not. I want to find out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Good: Page 11, line 12, after the second word "each," strike out "one-half" and all of lines 13 and 14 and insert "said privates to be selected by the Superintendent of the Capitol."

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, one-half of the amount appropriated for the policing of the Capitol is disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and one-half by the Sergeant at Arms of the House. One-half of this police force is selected by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the re-

maining half by the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and now for the remainder of this year the Superintendent of the Capitol will select the persons to be added to this force, who will be under his direction.

The point brought out by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] was that we are dividing here the responsibility of a little army brought here to protect the Nation's Capitol, to preserve the property, and yet we are scattering the responsibility, so far as dividing the command of that army among three officials of the Government is concerned. There ought to be one man responsible for that force—one man responsible for any depredations to the Government property here at the Capitol—and I do not believe you will ever get that desired responsibility until you place the control in one single person. I do not know whether Mr. Elliott Woods, the Superintendent of the Capitol, is the person to be in command of this force or not, but I do know that that responsibility—and it is a great responsibility—ought not to be vested in three persons. It ought not to be vested in two persons. There ought to be but one responsible head, and it seems to me that when a suggestion is made that is so eminently sound and businesslike as that made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] our committee and this House ought to adopt it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to place the Capitol police force all under the control of Mr. Elliott Woods. Mr. Woods, as we all know, is one of the most efficient men that there is up here on Capitol Hill. He has to do with the management of the Capitol Building and Grounds. No man has a higher regard for Mr. Woods than I have.

If this police force is to be reorganized, it seems to me that the committee should have taken the action necessary before they reported this bill to the House. I do not know whether this force ought to be brought under the control of Mr. Woods or not, but the police force as now constituted is under one head—a captain. I do not know who he is. It may not be a good thing to have the responsibility of the management of this police force divided between three persons, but I think before the House takes action of this kind it ought to be studied out, and there ought to be a properly prepared amendment, and that no one ought to undertake to offer an amendment here, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goob] has done, who is a member of the committee, and had a long time to study this proposition. I think the provision offered by the gentleman from Iowa is subject to the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The law authorizing the appointment of this force provides—

There shall be a captain of police, the member of which shall be appointed by the Sergeants at Arms of the two Houses and the architect of the Capitol Extension. There shall be a captain of the Capitol police and such other members with such rates of compensation, respectively, as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

It seems to me it is clearly subject to a point of order. Do I understand the gentleman to make it?

Mr. FOSTER. I will make the point of order; but let me say before I do so that I am not averse to any proper arrangement, but I believe we ought to have it done in the right way. If there is to be a reorganization, I shall not object to it; but I do not believe we ought to adopt this amendment at this time and in this way. If the gentleman wishes to draw a provision placing the police force of the Capitol all under one head, I should not object to such a provision if properly worked out. I make a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GOOD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Speaker: Secretary to Speaker, \$4,000; clerk to Speaker's table, \$3,000, and for preparing Digest of the Rules, \$1,000 per annum; clerk to Speaker, \$1,600; messenger to Speaker, \$1,440; messenger to Speaker's table, \$1,200; in all, \$12,840.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. We have had a rather strenuous week. I wonder how late he expects to continue with this measure today?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I had hoped that the committee would be willing to sit patiently in session until 5 o'clock. The gentleman is aware of the fact that very liberal time was extended in general debate, and we have not had much opportunity to read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Clerk: Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$6,500; hire of horse and wagon for use of the Clerk's office, \$900, or so much thereof as may be necessary; chief clerk, \$4,500; journal clerk, and two reading clerks, at \$4,000 each; disbursing clerk, \$3,400; tally clerk, \$3,300; file clerk, \$3,250; enrolling clerk, \$3,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; chief bill clerk, \$3,000; assistant to chief clerk, and assistant enrolling clerk, at \$2,500 each; assistant to disbursing clerk, \$2,400; stationery clerk, \$2,200; librarian, \$2,100; assistant file clerk, \$1,900; two assistant librarians, messenger and assistant Journal clerk, at \$1,800 each; clerks—one \$1,800, three at \$1,680 each; bookkeeper, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$1,600 each; four assistants to chief bill clerk, at \$1,500 each; stenographer to Clerk, \$1,400; locksmith, who shall be skilled in his trade, \$1,300; messenger in chief clerk's office, and assistant in stationery room, at \$1,200 each; messenger in file room, messenger in disbursing office, and assistant in House library, at \$1,100 each; stenographer to chief bill clerk, \$1,000; seven telephone operators, at \$900 each; three session telephone operators, at \$75 per month each from December 1, 1918, to March 31, 1919; substitute telephone operator when required, at \$2.50 per day; \$500; two laborers in bathroom, at \$900 each; six laborers, at \$720 each; page in enrolling room, \$720; two janitors, at \$720 each; allowance to chief clerk for stenographic and typewriter services, \$1,000; in all, \$102,270.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I notice that this paragraph totals nearly \$2,000 more than last year. What increases have been inserted? Have these laborers in the bathroom had their salaries raised?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I may state to the gentleman that the only increases in this paragraph consist of \$1,000 additional for the enrolling clerk. The gentleman will notice that the provision reads:

Enrolling clerk \$3,000, and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

That was incorporated in this bill because of a House resolution passed heretofore, which is now the law so far as the House is concerned.

Mr. WALSH. I notice that increase.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The other increases are two telephone operators, at \$900 each. Those are the increases. The appropriation is reduced from what it would otherwise have been on account of the fact that the next session will be a short session.

Mr. WALSH. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. In lines 19 and 20 there are two laborers for the bathroom, at \$900 each. Does that refer to the bathroom in the House Office Building?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I so understand.

Mr. WALSH. How is it that the bathroom in the House Office Building is under the jurisdiction of the Clerk, while the tonorial parlors are under the jurisdiction of the Doorkeeper?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I really can not tell the gentleman why that is. It has been the custom ever since the House Office Building was erected and first occupied, as I understand. The committee have simply followed the established custom and have continued the appropriation in this manner. I do not know whether it was because originally the Clerk was supposed to have peculiar knowledge and qualifications concerning the duties of a bathroom attendant or not, or whether the Doorkeeper was supposed to have peculiar tonorial abilities.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. These bathroom laborers were under the Clerk of the House before the House Office Building was erected, when the bathroom was in the Capitol.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], who has been here a great number of years, longer than the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and myself, has, I think, given a very clear explanation.

Mr. WALSH. They were under the jurisdiction of the Clerk before the House Office Building was erected, in the old days when they not only had bathrooms, but when thirst might be quenched downstairs in the Capitol.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman says I have been here a long time. I have not been here so long as that. [Laughter.] There was no place where a thirst could be satisfied when I came here.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to know if these two laborers are in the classified service or in the patronage that goes to the party that may be unfortunate enough to be in power?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. One, I understand, has been here 40 years and another 17 years.

Mr. WALSH. I think they are classified. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Where is the provision for the compensation of the Speaker?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is carried on page 12. His salary being fixed by law it is carried in that lump appropriation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In express terms you provide for the salary a little later for the President, \$75,000, and the Vice President, \$12,000. Their salaries are fixed by law. Why should the Speaker be omitted and these two salaries mentioned which are fixed by law?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The President is an executive officer and it has been the custom to appropriate his salary in specific terms. It is a matter of custom; this bill could appropriate for each Member individually if it was desired to do so, but this has been the custom.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The salary of the President is fixed by law and so is that of the Vice President.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will pardon me, let me say that the Vice President is not a Member of the Senate, while the Speaker of the House is a Member of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks, messengers, and janitors to the following committees: Accounts—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$1,000; Agriculture—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$1,000; Appropriations—clerk \$4,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, assistant clerk and stenographer \$2,500, assistant clerks—1 \$1,900, 1 \$1,800, janitor \$1,000; Banking and Currency—clerk \$2,000, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Census—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Claims—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Coinage, Weights, and Measures—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; District of Columbia—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$720; Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress—clerk \$2,000; Elections No. 1—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$1,000; Elections No. 2—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Elections No. 3—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Enrolled bills—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Flood Control—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Foreign Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$720; Immigration and Naturalization—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Indian Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$720; Industrial Arts and Expositions—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Insular Affairs—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Interstate and Foreign Commerce—clerk \$2,500, additional clerk \$2,000, assistant clerk \$1,500, janitor \$1,000; Irrigation of Arid Lands—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Invalid Pensions—clerk \$2,500, stenographer \$2,190, assistant clerk \$2,000, janitor \$1,000; Judiciary—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,600, janitor \$720; Labor—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Library—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Merchant Marine and Fisheries—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Military Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,500, janitor \$1,000; Mines and Mining—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Naval Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,500, janitor \$1,000; Patents—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Pensions—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,600, janitor \$720; Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,400, janitor \$1,000; Printing—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$1,000; Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Public Lands—clerk \$2,000, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Revision of the Laws—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Rivers and Harbors—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$1,000; Roads—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Rules—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Territories—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; War Claims—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Ways and Means—clerk \$3,000, assistant clerk and stenographer \$2,000, assistant clerk \$1,900, janitors—1 \$1,000, 1 \$720; in all, \$171,790.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to make a few observations in reference to some of the inequalities, apparently, in the treatment of compensation that is paid to the assistants for these various committees. I desire to direct the attention of the committee to one very important committee which has been able to struggle along without a janitor, and I congratulate the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Judge RUCKER], the Committee on Election of President and Vice President, in being able to get along with simply a single clerk. And I wonder how it is that the great and extremely busy Committee on Elections No. 1 requires a clerk at \$2,000, a janitor at \$1,000, when the equally distinguished and busy Committee on Elections No. 2 gets along with a clerk at \$2,000 and a janitor at \$720.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I notice that there are only one or two cases where a janitor gets \$1,000; most of the others get \$720.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know why the particular service in these two places are so much more valuable than the other places.

Mr. WALSH. That had occurred to me in making these observations. I wondered why it was that the janitor of the Committee on Printing received \$1,000 and the Committee on Invalid Pensions has a clerk at \$2,500, a stenographer at \$2,190, an assistant clerk at \$2,000, and a janitor at \$1,000, while the Committee on War Claims, which has not been very active during this Congress, is given a clerk at \$2,500, an assistant clerk at \$2,200, and a janitor at \$720.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs can get along with a clerk at \$2,500, an assistant at \$1,500, and a janitor,

that these other committees, which especially during the war session have not been very active, can get along with less help. This Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs have had some measures of the greatest importance, and yet we provide them in this bill—I do not know whether there are any special resolutions or not—for less assistance than we do to some other committees that have had much less to do. I suppose there must be some reason for it.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the gentleman noticed that the important Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions has a clerk at \$2,000 and a janitor at \$750? How many expositions have there been for the last year or so?

Mr. WALSH. I do not know of any expositions which have been held in the country as a result of legislation initiated by this committee within the last year or so.

Mr. MADDEN. I should think that this clerk would be overworked, and I am sure that the janitor must be. Some day, if the committee should by chance have a meeting, I suppose they will bring in a bill for extra compensation.

Mr. WALSH. Either that or for services of a doctor. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill further, in all seriousness, whether this is a matter that is taken as a matter of course each year, or whether any attempt is made in framing the bill to ascertain whether the services are needed or whether it is necessary to have these assistants that have heretofore been provided for.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that the committee never investigates the necessity of the employment of these clerks and assistant clerks and janitors to committees, for the reason that they are already provided for by House resolution. The committee therefore feels that it has no discretion, in view of the action of the House taken by resolution, to fail to make appropriation for their salaries.

Some committees have stated that they do not have sufficient help and we have informed them that the proper way to secure it was by a resolution formally introduced in the House, so that it could go to the Committee on Accounts and be taken up in the regular way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman mean that if way back in 1897 Congress appropriated for an employee for some of these committees the Appropriations Committee would from year to year continue the appropriations?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; not if the Appropriations Committee was convinced that the services of an employee in any department of the House was not necessary to be continued. In such case it would call the attention of the House to it and the House could take such action as it pleased. But I assume that the committees are as busy to-day as they were in 1897. The work of the committees of the House has grown tremendously, and it is certainly a safe assumption to say that if clerks were necessary in 1897 they are necessary now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I notice that the Committee on Roads has a clerk at \$2,000 per annum and a janitor at \$720 per annum. This committee has not been a very active one during this session, yet during the last Congress it was one of the important committees of the House and did a great deal of work. I have the honor to serve on that great committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the gentleman say "serve"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman mean that he is a member of that committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am a member of that committee. But there has not been a meeting of our committee now for some time.

Mr. DYER. That clerk must be overworked.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, I am at loss to know what the duties of the clerk and the janitor of that committee are at this time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sure the gentleman ought to know more about the duties of the clerk and the janitor to his committee than the gentleman who is in charge of this bill. Has the gentleman any idea that there would be objection to a motion to eliminate the clerk and janitor of this committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I would not object. I do not know what the chairman of the committee thinks about it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, let us try. I move to amend on page 15, line 24, by striking out the provision for the clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 24, strike out, after the word "roads," the words "clerk, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBBINS) there were—ayes 3, noes 33.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the House while I recur to a suggestion I made a moment ago and the reply that was made to it by the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I called attention to the fact that on page 29 there is this provision:

For compensation of the President of the United States, \$75,000.

For compensation of the Vice President of the United States, \$12,000—

And that there is no similar provision in express terms for the compensation to the Speaker. Thereupon the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] rose and said that the reason that there was an express provision for the Vice President was that the Vice President is not a Member of the Senate, whereas the Speaker is a Member of the House. That, however, is merely the custom—that the Speaker is a Member of the House. The House could elect anybody not a Member of the House as its Speaker at any time. It could, in its discretion, depose the present Speaker and elect another who is an entire outsider, and if that should happen this provision would not be applicable at all.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In a moment. Then this provision would not be applicable to the next House of Representatives until it shall have chosen a Member of the House as its Speaker, and in strict accuracy the language ought to be changed. I do not desire to be hypercritical about it, but my suggestion was well founded, because the next Speaker of the House of Representatives may not be a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. FESS. By what authority does the gentleman say that this House could elect some one its Speaker who is not a Member of the House?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Because the Constitution provides simply that the House of Representatives shall elect a Speaker, and we could elect a Speaker who is not a Member of the House, exactly as does the House of Commons in England.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, to make the observation that I do not believe that that statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] that the House could elect as its Speaker one who is not a Member of the House.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit one interruption right there, so that I may call his attention to the language of the Constitution, for then he may not wish to continue his statement.

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The Constitution reads:

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers.

The words "and other officers" have uniformly been held to mean that they could in their discretion elect anyone a Speaker who is not a Member of the House, just as they choose their officers from gentlemen who are not Members of the House.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, simply because there has not been a Speaker elected who was not a Member of the House would not, of course, be conclusive that it could not be done.

Therefore I do not offer that as an argument that it could not have been, but the language employed, read by the gentleman from Wisconsin, is not to be interpreted, I take it, that the membership of this House could go beyond its membership to select its chief officer, because under the rules of the House the Speaker of the House can vote on every measure whether his vote will change the result or not. Now, in the Senate the presiding officer can not vote on every measure, but only in case of a tie, but in this House the presiding officer can vote on every measure. Now, in case that he was not a Member of this House he certainly could not vote on any measure.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin might have it in his mind the danger of the House electing the Secretary of the Treasury to another job. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. That is a very pertinent observation.

Mr. GARNER. It occurs to me the gentleman from Wisconsin is absolutely correct in the construction of the Constitution, and I do not see where the point that the gentleman from Ohio makes is tenable here because the rules are made after the Speaker has been elected and the House is organized, and it is only by virtue of the rules that the Speaker is permitted to vote. I will illustrate. Suppose we come in here and elect some distinguished gentleman, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, Speaker of the House and made no change of the rules providing that he could not vote; he would still be Speaker of the House and would not violate the Constitution.

Mr. HAMLIN. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion, I think the gentleman from Texas is wrong in his premises. The Speaker of the House is permitted to vote by virtue of the fact that he is a Member of the House, and the House would not be authorized to take from him that privilege because he is a Member of the House.

Mr. FESS. That would be my interpretation of it.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is unquestionably and undoubtedly so.

Mr. FESS. I think the observation made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] a while ago was well made and is the real explanation of putting it in a lump sum in one case and setting out the Vice President in the other.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Doorkeeper: Doorkeeper, \$5,000; maintenance and repair of folding room motor truck, \$500, or so much thereof as may be necessary; special employee, \$1,500; superintendent of reporters' gallery, \$1,600; janitor, \$1,500; messengers—16 at \$1,180 each, 14 on soldiers' roll at \$1,200 each; laborers—17 at \$720 each, 2 known as cloakroom men at \$840 each, 8 known as cloakroom men, 1 \$600 and 1 \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, and 7 at \$600 each; 2 female attendants in ladies' retiring rooms at \$800 each; superintendent of folding room, \$2,500; foreman, \$1,800; 3 clerks, at \$1,600 each; messenger, \$1,200; janitor, \$720; laborer, \$720; 32 folders, at \$900 each; 2 drivers, at \$840 each; 2 chief pages, at \$1,200 each; 2 messengers in charge of telephones (1 for the minority), at \$1,500 each; 46 pages, during the session, including 2 riding pages, 4 telephone pages, press-gallery page, and 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at \$2.50 per day each, \$13,800; superintendent of document room, \$2,900; assistant superintendent, \$2,100; clerk, \$1,700; assistant clerk, \$1,600; assistants—7 at \$1,280 each, 1 \$1,100; janitor, \$920; messenger to press room, \$1,000; in all, \$147,920.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I may not be quite in order in this place in what I wish to say, but I thought, while we were here close to the paragraph for employees of the Office Building, that it would not be amiss to call attention to the fact that in my room they have only washed the windows once since this session began and only furnish towels every other day, and the rest of the time we have not got any, and no attempt is being made to keep the rooms clean. If the kind of janitor service which we are receiving there was rendered in a private office building there would be a good deal of a row about it. There is not any reason why we should not have the offices kept clean, there is no reason why the windows should not be washed, there is no reason why towels should not be supplied and soap. It may be that some people do not care to wash, but I do once in a while.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Does not the gentleman think cobwebs ought to be removed once in a while?

Mr. MADDEN. I think we ought to have a real janitor service. We have got enough people on the pay roll to give the service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I just wondered if the gentleman had called the attention of the commission which has charge of the House Office Building to this.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I have not. I do not think it is necessary for me to get down on my knees to the man in charge of the building to get service. We ought to have it without appealing to him.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was not referring to the superintendent of the building.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to be put in the attitude of asking favors from the man in charge of the building.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The point of my inquiry, if the gentleman will pardon me, was this: The commission, which the gentleman knows consists of three distinguished Members of this House, no doubt is not acquainted with the facts the gentleman has stated, and I am sure they would be very glad to have the gentleman give them this information.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know the membership of the commission—

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield for a second? I suggest this, that if the gentleman makes a complaint to the House Office Building commission or any member thereof he will have to leave the House Office Building in order to find those Members, because no one of the Members has his office in the House Office Building itself, strange as it may appear.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, the men who are acting as commissioners for the building are a favored set.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No; I understand it is the statute. The statute was framed, undoubtedly, without due consideration of the fact that the Speaker, who is a member of it, has his room in the Capitol; that the minority leader has his room in the Capitol; and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has his room in the Capitol. So it finally results that the three gentlemen charged with the administration of the House Office Building have their offices in the Capitol.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, they do not understand the importance of having clean rooms in the other building. They do not visit the building at all and do not understand the situation.

And I wish to call attention also while I am on my feet to the fact that the elevator service over there is very poor, and the elevator men do not give much attention. I do not want to complain about the men if I can help it, but I am complaining about the system, and there is no regulation requiring them to give respectful consideration to those who ride upon the elevators. They smoke when ladies are on the elevators, which ought not to be allowed. They come when they please. If you are on the second floor and you ring for them to come, they pass you by frequently without waiting to find whether you want to go up or down. They do not know whether you are a Member of Congress or not, and do not care.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman tell why during the rush hour, when we quit here at night, that nine times out of ten there is but one elevator there, and we have to stay down in the basement and wait for an elevator? And at the noon hour it is the same way.

Mr. MADDEN. We have 14 elevator men over there, and I think only six elevators. I think if we have 14 men we ought to have sufficient elevators to keep them employed.

Mr. COX. They ought to work.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I say.

Mr. ROBBINS. My experience over there is that they have gone into my offices and taken out the hair brushes and—

Mr. MADDEN. You would not say that about the elevator force.

Mr. ROBBINS. I say that about the janitor force.

Mr. MADDEN. All I can say is that when I leave here I take everything of any value and lock it up, and no matter how hard it is locked up, when I come back it is gone.

Mr. PURNELL. Will the gentleman kindly pay his respects to the cockroaches while he is on his feet?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not associate with them. [Laughter.]

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important item, and of course the criticisms that have been made are also very important, and I think are of vital interest to the Members, in view of the present emergency, and I think we ought to have a larger attendance in order to discuss this matter. I do not want to hasten the gentleman from Tennessee unduly, but I do make the point of no quorum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will not the gentleman from Massachusetts allow us to get down to the bottom of the next page?

Mr. WALSH. I have a great many inquiries that I wish to make in reference to this item, and I do not think we can do that before 5 o'clock.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Of course, if the gentleman insists I will yield to him and move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Sunday, March 3, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War, submitting a proposed clause of legislation for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 963), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 255) authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or allied forces, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 353), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3299) authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Chalmers G. Hall, retired, to the active list of the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 352), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9331) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Brown, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 10394) to add certain lands to the Minam National Forest, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 10395) providing for the repair, improvement, and construction of ice piers in the harbor of Maysville, Ky., on the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 10396) relating to admission to the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 10397) to amend certain sections of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 10398) to amend and reenact sections 139, 157, 164, and 175 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 10399) to ratify and confirm the constitution of the Seneca Nation of Indians, to enact as a Federal law certain provisions of the Indian law of the State of New York, and to grant to the council of the Seneca Nation of Indians the right to regulate hunting, fishing, and trapping on reservation lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging the passage of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging the passage of the daylight bill, so called, now pending in Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial adopted by the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the passage of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, urging the passage of the daylight-saving bill, so called, now pending before Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 10400) granting a pension to Herman Platz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 10401) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. West; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 10402) granting a pension to Sabina Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10403) for the relief of the heirs, assigns, and legal representatives of William Watson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10404) to reimburse John Anderson, former postmaster at Sandborn, Knox County, Ind., for stamps and funds stolen from the post office; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10405) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Macy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10406) granting an increase of pension to Henry F. Caplick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10407) granting an increase of pension to John Felzen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10408) granting a pension to Catharine Bamberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10409) granting a pension to Jane F. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 10410) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Foster; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 10411) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 10412) for the relief of Stephen J. Haff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10413) granting an increase of pension to John W. Edie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10414) granting an increase of pension to John A. Coutts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 10415) granting a pension to William Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10416) granting an increase of pension to David H. York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10417) granting an increase of pension to Jackson Brandenburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10418) granting an increase of pension to William P. Dorton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 10419) granting a pension to Arthur E. Garland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STAFFORD: A bill (H. R. 10420) granting an increase of pension to Michael Reichert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10421) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hollander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 10422) granting an increase of pension to Edward McIntyre; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 10423) granting a pension to Andrew F. Wellley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10424) granting a pension to Mary H. Mills; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10425) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Paxson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10426) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Horner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10427) granting an increase of pension to William D. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10428) granting an increase of pension to Frances L. Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 10429) granting a pension to William B. Stroepe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 10430) granting an increase of pension to James Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of the farmers of Franklin County, Mo.; members of the Smith Schoolhouse Farm Club, of Lincoln County, Mo.; and sundry farmers of Lincoln County, asking that the Food Administration set more equitable prices for produce of the farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), a resolution of the City Council of Minneapolis, requesting Congress to grant the President broad powers to fix prices of food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the Yavapai (Ariz.) County Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the passage of the Foster bill; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also (by request), memorial of Lincoln County Sunday School Association, urging passage of emergency war prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of St. Luke's Hospital Social Service, asking that military rank after the model of the Canadian service be given to members of our Nursing Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of the Missouri State Medical Association, favoring the Dyer bill, H. R. 9563; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions of the Lithuanians of Shenandoah, Pa., asking that Lithuania be allowed to send delegates to the peace conference, at the close of the war, as an independent nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of the board of governors of the Investment Bankers' Association of America, favoring the principles of the war corporation finance bill and suggesting changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), resolution of the Wilmadous Club, Gordon, Ga., and the Laverne Tourist Club, Laverne, Minn., asking for the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), letter of Alan R. Hawley, president of the Aero Club of America, protesting against the proposed reduction of pay to our aviators, giving reasons for position taken; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BLAND: Evidence to accompany a special pension bill to grant a pension to Sabina Chaney, widow of William J. Burcham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in the case to reimburse John Anderson, former postmaster at Sanborn, Knox County, Ind., for funds stolen from the post office on the night of February 18, 1907; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution of the Milwaukee Typographical Union, No. 23, favoring the Sherwood bill to pension all American workers of a certain age; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, resolution of the New York Zoological Society, regarding enabling act for migratory-bird treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Resolution of the New York Zoological Society, regarding enabling act for migratory-bird treaty with Canada; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution of the Cleveland Clearing House Association, relative to extension of time of payment of income and excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD: Memorial of the Underwriters' Association of Chicago, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: Evidence to accompany House bill, 10377 in re claim of Ira C. Kilpatrick and Guy C. Dill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution of the Boston Typographical Union, No. 13, favoring the Sherwood bill, providing old-age pensions for all American workmen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of board of governors of the Investment Bankers' Association of America, favoring the principles of the War Finance Corporation bill, but suggesting certain changes in it; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Lumermen's Exchange, of the city of Philadelphia, favoring a board of war control and a director of munitions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Gottschalk Co., Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of House bill 9248; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of 65 citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging an increase in the salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging the provision of necessary money for the early completion of the improvements of the Ohio River, and also for the enactment of legislation providing for the immediate construction by the Government of the Lake Erie and Ohio River Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the council of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging the provision of necessary money for the early completion of the improvements of the Ohio River, and also for the enactment of legislation providing for the immediate construction by the Government of the Lake Erie and Ohio River Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.